Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs

ANSWERS TO LITURGICAL QUESTIONS

Volume Two

Answers to Liturgical Questions

In Appreciation

Publication of this work was made possible
in part through the generosity of:

John, Tina, and Emmanuel J. Melonakos, M.D.

and

FAITH: An Endowment for Orthodoxy and Hellenism

We deeply appreciate and are grateful for their support.

Answers to Liturgical Questions by Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs:

A Complete and Annotated Translation

(Based on the 5th Edition of Apostolikē Diakonia)

Volume 2

Questions 151–300

General Editor and Translator
Patrick Viscuso

Associate Editors and Translators
John Margetis, Anton Vrame

Contributors
Patrick O'Grady and Andreas Houpos

HOLY CROSS
ORTHODOX PRESS
Brookline, Massachusetts

Published by Holy Cross Orthodox Press
Hellenic College, Inc.
50 Goddard Avenue Brookline, MA 02445
© Patrick Viscuso, John Margetis, and Anton Vrame, 2024

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise with the prior permission of Holy Cross Orthodox Press.

ISBN
978-1-935317-88-3 Vol 2 (hardcover)
978-1-935317-93-7 1-935317-93-8 SET

The copyright holder of the books *Απαντήσεις εις λειτουργικάς απορίας* by Ioannis Foundoulis is Apostoliki Diakonia. This translation has been licensed by Apostoliki Diakonia for the First (1st Edition). All rights reserved.

Publisher's Cataloging-in-Publication Data
(Provided by Cassidy Cataloguing Services, Inc.)

Names: Phountoulēs, Iōannēs M., 1927-2007, author. | Viscuso, Patrick, 1956- editor, translator. | Margetis, John, editor, translator. | Vrame, Anton C., editor, translator. | Houpos, Andreas, contributor. | Papiris, Dionysios, contributor.

Title: Answers to liturgical questions by Iōannēs M. Phountoulēs : a complete and annotated translation / general editor and translator, Patrick Viscuso ; associate editors and translators: John Margetis, Anton Vrame ; contributors, Andreas Houpos and Dionysios Papiris.

Other titles: Apantēseis eis leitourgikas aporias. English

Description: First English edition. | Brookline, Massachusetts : Holy Cross Orthodox Press, [2023] | Translation of: Apantēseis eis leitourgikas aporias. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: ISBN: 978-1-935317-93-7 (set) | 978-1-935317-87-6 (v. 1 hardbound) | 978-0-916586-06-5 (v. 1 paperback) | 978-1-935317-88-3 (v. 2 hardbound) | 978-0-916586-19-5 (v. 2 paperback) | 978-1-935317-89-0 (v. 3 hardbound) | 978-0-916586-20-1 (v. 3 paperback) | 978-1-935317-90-6 (v. 4 hardbound) | 978-0-916586-22-5 (v. 4 paperback) | 978-1-935317-91-3 (v. 5 hardbound) | 978-0-916586-27-0 (v. 5 paperback) | 978-1-935317-92-0 (v. 6 hardbound) | 978-0-916586-28-7 (v. 6 paperback)

Subjects: LCSH: Orthodox Eastern Church--Liturgy--History. | Orthodox Eastern Church--Doctrines. | Sacraments--Orthodox Eastern Church. | Orthodox Eastern Church--Apologetic works.

Classification: LCC: BX350.A5 V57 2023 | DDC: 264/.019009--dc23

CONTENTS

Abbreviations vi

Translation of the Original Title Page xi

Prologue to the First Edition xiii

Questions and Answers 1

Appendix 1 (Question 298) Scripture Passages for the Mystical Supper 407

Appendix 2 (Question 298) Anaphora Comparison 411

Abbreviations

AASS—*Acta sanctorum quotquot toto orbe coluntur* (Antwerp: 1643).

ANF—A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Fathers Down to 325 A.D.*, 10 vols. (1885–1887; Repr., Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1989).

BDAG—Frederick W. Danker, Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

Benešević—Vladimir Benešević, "Отвѣты Петра Хартофилакса," Записки императорской академии наукъ, vol. VIII no. 14 St. Petersburg 1909.

Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins*—René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966).

Cambridge—J. Diggle, B. L. Fraser, P. James, O. B. Simkin, A. A. Thompson, S. J. Westripp, eds., *The Cambridge Greek Lexicon*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021).

CPG—Maurice Geerard, ed., *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, 5 vols. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1974–1987).

Dēmētrakos—Δημήτριος Δημητράκος, ed., *Μέγα λεξικὸν ὅλης τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς γλώσσης*, 15 vols (Ἀθῆναι: ἐκδόσεις Δόμη, 1964).

DOP—*Dumbarton Oaks Papers.*

Galadza—Daniel Galadza, *Liturgy and Byzantinization in Jerusalem*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

GCS—*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte.*

Goar, Εὐχολόγιον—J. Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον sive Rituale Græcorum complectens ritus et ordines Divinæ Liturgiæ, officiorum, sacramentorum, consecrationum, benedictionum, funerum, orationum, etc. cuilibet personae, statui vel tempori congruos, juxta usum Orientalis Ecclesiae... editio secunda expurgata, et accuratior* (Venice: Bartholomew Javarina, 1730).

Lampe—G. W. H. Lampe, ed., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).

Larin—Vassa Larin, *The Byzantine Hierarchical Divine Liturgy in Arsenij Suxanov's Proskinitawrij*, OCA 286 (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Orientale, 2010).

LBG—Erich Trapp, ed., *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität besonders des 9.-12. Jahrhunderts*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Byzantinistik VI/1-8 (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1994–2017).

Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarchat de Constantinople—Les Regestes du Patriarcat de Constantinople (Le Patriarcat Byzantine, Série I): vol. 1, *Les Actes de Patriarches.* fasc, 1, *Les Regestes de 381 à 715*, by Venance Grumel, ed. Jean Darrouzès, 2nd ed. (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1972); vol. 1, fasc. 2-3, *Les Regestes de 715 à 1206*, by Venance Grumel, ed. Jean Darrouzès, 2nd ed. (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1989); vol. 1, fasc. 4, *Les Regestes de 1208 à 1309*, by Vitalien Laurent (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1971); vol. 1, fasc. 5, *Les Regestes de 1310 à 1376*, by Jean Darrouzès (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1977); vol. 1, fasc. 6, *Les Regestes de 1377 à 1410, by Jean Darrouzès* (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1979); vol. fasc. 7, *Les Regestes de 1410 à 1453*, by Jean Darrouzès (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1991). (References are to the documents, which are numbered in chronological order consecutively throughout).

LSJ—Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed. with revised supplement (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).

Mansi—Giovanni Domenico Mansi, ed., *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima Collectio.*

Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1—Juan Mateos, ed. and trans., *Le Typicon de la Grande Église. Ms. Sainte-Croix no. 40, Xe siècle. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, Tome I, Le Cycle des Douze Mois*, OCA 165 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1962).

Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2—Juan Mateos, ed. and trans., *Le Typicon de la Grande Église. Ms. Sainte-Croix no. 40, Xe siècle. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, Tome II, Le Cycle des Fêtes Mobiles*, OCA 166 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1963).

NETS—Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

OCA—Orientalia Christiana Analecta.

OCD—Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth, eds., *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press).

OCP—*Orientalia Christiana Periodica.*

ODB—Alexander P. Kazhdan et al, eds., *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium,* 3 vols. (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*—Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy,* 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

PG—J.-P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series graeca,* 161 vols. in 166 pts. (Paris: 1857–1866).

RSV—Revised Standard Version.

Rhallēs and Potlēs—Γ.Α. Ῥάλλης καὶ Μ. Ποτλῆς, *Σύνταγμα θείων καὶ ἱερῶν Κανόνων τῶν τε Ἁγίων καὶ Πανευφήμων Ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν Οἰκουμενικῶν καὶ τοπικῶν Συνόδων καὶ τῶν κατὰ μέρος Ἁγίων Πατέρων,* 6 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: Γ. Χαρτοφύλαξ, 1852–1859).

SC—Sources Chrétiennes.

Simmons, *St. Symeon*—Harry L.N. Simmons, trans., *St. Symeon of Thessalonike, Treatise on Prayer* (Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1984).

Sophocles—E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (From B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914).

Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika*—Steven Hawkes-Teeples, ed. and trans., *St. Symeon of Thessalonika, The Liturgical Commentaries,* vol. 168 of *Studies and Texts* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2011).

The History of Byzantine and Eastern Canon Law—Wilfred Hartmann and Kenneth Pennington, eds., *The History of Byzantine and Eastern Canon Law* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012).

Thomas and Hero—John Thomas and Angela Constantinides Hero, eds., *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents: A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments,* 5 vols. (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2000).

Tolika—Ὀλυμπία Τολικά, *Ἐπίτομο Ἐγκυκλοπαιδικὸ Λεξικὸ τῆς Βυζαντινῆς Μουσικῆς* (Ἀθῆναι: Εὐρωπαϊκὸ Κέντρο Τέχνης, 1993).

Woodfin—Warren T. Woodfin, *The Embodied Icon, Liturgical Vestments and Sacramental Power in Byzantium*, Oxford Studies in Byzantium (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Χρηστοήθεια τῶν χριστιανῶν*—Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Χρηστοήθεια τῶν χριστιανῶν: Περιέχουσα Λόγους ψυχωφελεστάτους δεκατρεῖς, ῥυθμίζοντας ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον τὰ κακὰ ἤθη τῶν Χριστιανῶν. Πρὸς δὲ, καὶ τὰς κυριωτέρας Ἐντολὰς τῆς Παλαιᾶς καὶ Νέας Διαθήκης* (*Morality for Christians: Containing thirteen Orations profiting the soul, which educate to improve the bad morals of Christians. And in addition, also the authoritative Commandments of the Old and New Testaments*) (Venice: Ἐν τῇ Τυπογραφίᾳ Νικολάου Γλυκὺ τοῦ ἐξ Ἰωαννίνων, 1803).

ΘΗΕ—*Θρησκευτικὴ καὶ Ἠθικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια*, 12 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: Ἀθαν. Μαρτίνος, 1962–1968).

ΜΕΕ—Παῦλος Δρανδάκης, ed., *Μεγάλη Ἑλληνικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια*, 24 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: Πυρσός, 1927–1934).

Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυλογίας*—Α. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυλογίας*, 5 vols. (St. Petersburg: Β. Κιρσπάουμ, 1891–1898).

Σταυρινός, *Ἡ Ἱερολογία*—Ἀμβρόσιος Σταυρινός, *Ἡ Ἱερολογία τοῦ γάμου ἀπὸ τὰ τέλη τοῦ Θ΄ μέχρι τοῦ τέλους τοῦ ΙΣΤ΄ αἰώνος* (Κωνσταντινούπολη: Ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1923).

Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*—Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας*, Texte und Forschungen zur Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Philologie no. 15 (Ἀθῆναι: Ἡ ἐπιστημονικὴ ἐπιτροπὴ πρὸς ἀναθεώρησιν καὶ ἔκδοσιν τῶν λειτουργικῶν βιβλίων, 1935).

Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*—Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 2 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1950–1955).

Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей—А. А. Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, хранящихся въ библиотекахъ Православного Востока, 3 vols. (Киев: Г. Т. Корчакъ-Новицкаго, 1895–1917).

IŌANNĒS M. PHOUNTOULĒS

ANSWERS TO LITURGICAL QUESTIONS

Volume 2

151–300

5th Edition

TO THE
SACRED MEMORY
OF IAKŌVOS G. KLEOMVROTOS
METROPOLITAN OF MYTILENE
(† JUNE 6, 1987)

Prologue to the First Edition

With the assistance of God, a third set of one hundred *Answers to Liturgical Questions* (151–300) has also been completed. These were published in the periodical Ὁ Ἐφημέριος from the October 15, 1968, up until the February 1–15, 1976 issue, and are edited in this second volume, which was supplemented and revised where necessary.

Through them, an entire decade (1965–1976) has been completed of continuous collaboration in this periodical. A variety of liturgical subjects have been analyzed and answers have been given to the extent possible to questions, some of them more difficult and others less so. From the tables, according to material and article, which are appended at the end of each volume, the extent of the effort becomes clear, which gradually stretches to cover the entire field of teleturgics.[1] The answers have already entered the fourth set of one hundred and many more questions of pious readers are awaiting their response.

Warm thanks are due to the ones making queries, because they provide in this manner an opportunity for learning not only for themselves and for other readers, but much more also personally for the one who responds. "Thank you, O Brother," wrote Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki, "for urged by you to compose this work, I am learning

1. In response to the author's wishes expressed in the introduction to volume five, a comprehensive index to all five volumes has replaced these tables and is contained in a sixth volume, "In any case, it would be desirable, where God gives and anticipates the number of answers, that it be completed with a general alphabetical index by subject for the entire series, in order for the searching and finding of what is sought to be easily accessible, a matter which now is quite difficult with the existence of five individual indexes by volume" (Prologue, volume five).

certain necessary things, and am not ashamed to confess this. For your sake and mine, therefore, I shall speak further to the best of my ability" (*Dialogue*, chapter 78).[2]

In Thessaloniki on October 23, 1976
On the commemoration of the holy apostle
Iakōvos the Brother of God

Ph.

2. PG 155:253a. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, ed. and trans., *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika, The Liturgical Commentaries*, vol. 168 of *Studies and Texts* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2011), 167.

Questions and Answers

151

When during the Divine Liturgy is the apolytikion of the saint of the temple not said?

There is no relevant rubric, but the following taxis is traditionally observed: On the great feasts of the Lord only the apolytikion of the feast is said, given that it alone constitutes the center around which the Church seeks exclusively to turn the attention of the faithful. Thus, during the Nativity, Theophany, the Meeting, the Annunciation, the Saturday of Lazarus, Palm Sunday, Pascha, the Sunday of Thomas, Mid-Pentecost, the Ascension, the Sunday of Pentecost, the Transfiguration, and on the great feasts of the Precious Cross, namely, the Exaltation and the Veneration of the Cross, the apolytikion of the saint of the temple will not be chanted. If the temple is dedicated in the name of the Lord, the apolytikion specifically for the feast of the temple (Nativity, Transfiguration, Resurrection, Ascension, and so forth) is not said during the periods of other feasts of the Lord. If the temple is dedicated in the name of the Theotokos or of the Forerunner, the same applies as in the case of another saint, but in addition on the feasts of the Mother of God and on feasts of the Forerunner, the apolytikion of the feast to which the temple is dedicated is not said if it is different from the feast taking precedence on that day. For example, if the temple is consecrated in the name of the Dormition of the Theotokos, the apolytikion of its feast day would not be chanted on the Nativity or the Entry of the Theotokos, and so forth. If the temple was consecrated in the name of the Beheading of the Forerunner and so forth, the apolytikion of the temple's feast day would not be chanted on the Nativity of the Forerunner, and so forth. Certainly, this taxis is logically correct.

152

During the night of Pascha, before the service of the Resurrection, must the lamps and lights of the temple be extinguished and then relit? During the time of darkness, is the seventh eōthinon doxastikon[1] of the grave tone supposed to be chanted, "Behold, the darkness and the dawn . . ."[2]? The Typikon does not refer to anything relating to this.

We have written repeatedly about the rite of the Resurrection on the occasion of other questions (see questions eighty-four, eighty-six, eighty-eight, and ninety-two). Sufficient material is presented there regarding the history and development of this service.

The above questions are referring to another element of the all-night vigil of Pascha. The present-day form of this element has been influenced by the well-known service of the Holy Light, which is performed in the temple of the Resurrection in Jerusalem during midday on Great Saturday. The services of the Holy Places influenced many elements in our services and especially those of Great Week. This was also to be expected because pilgrims from all parts of the world assembled in Jerusalem during these days and later locally imitated the impressive services that took place there. Specifically, the distribution of the "unwaning light,"[3] which precedes the enarxis of Matins of Pascha, neither is attested to by manuscripts, nor does it exist in the printed Pentēkostaria, but the Typikon mentions it in a footnote as a service that takes place by custom "in certain places."[4] Nowadays, insofar as I know, it has become prevalent everywhere, even on the Holy Mountain. However, in the manuscripts that describe the service of the Resurrection—where let it be noted that there is a whole multitude of Typika and Pentēkostaria—the lighting of the temple's candles, lamps, and lights always takes place, but not with the present festive manner. Namely, after the chanting

1. There are eleven eōthina doxastika and exaposteilaria associated with each of the eleven eōthina gospel readings, respectively.
2. "Ἰδοὺ σκοτία καὶ πρωΐ . . ."
3. "ἀνεσπέρου φωτός," literally, "never-setting light."
4. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 24–25, n. 1.

of the Midnight Office of the all-night vigil, tapers are distributed to the "brethren" (as is well known, the Typika refer to the practice of the monasteries). Then all exit to the narthēx, or to the place dedicated for the celebration of the service, and there, the tapers of the brethren are lit, while the sacristan remains behind in the temple and lights all the tapers, lamps, and the other lights, which up until that moment were obviously extinguished. According to other Typika, the lighting of the lamps and lights of the temple, as well as the candles of those present took place in the temple before exiting to the narthēx. The former taxis prevails in most Typika.

I cite the text from one of most ancient Typika, of the Monastery of the Evergetis in Constantinople, which is preserved in *Codex 788* of the National Library of Athens from the twelfth century: "Then, at the beginning at the eighth hour[5] or before [namely, about 2 a.m.], the great [sēmantron] is sounded, and once all the brethren have come out into the narthēx, the doors of the temple are shut. As they all stand and pray in silence, the sacristan[6] distributes the tapers to them, starting from the presider[7] down to the last one. The priest, along with the deacon, after he has changed his whole vestment including even the sticharion, censes within the holy sanctuary and outside, round about all the church, as the deacon holding a candle in his hands precedes. In this manner, they exit through the north side through which also entrances take place and first going over he censes the presider and all the right side, then the left side. When the priest goes out, immediately all light their tapers, likewise also within the sanctuary the assistant sacristans[8] light the candles of all the icons."[9] Or, according to another Typikon, "once all the brethren have assembled within the narthēx of the church . . . the presider distributes the tapers and all go over to where he is standing and we receive these from his hand; and when the presider lights his

5. The eighth hour of the night.
6. ὁ ἐκκλησιάρχης.
7. See question 302, for a discussion of the "presider" (προεστώς).
8. οἱ παρεκκλησιάρχαι.
9. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 506–507.

own candle, all light theirs" (*Vatican Codex 1877* from the thirteenth century).

As many codices describe it, the task of the sacristan within the temple was to light "all the tapers and lamps" and to fill the church with incense. According to a late manuscript Typikon of the Holy Mountain that represents the present-day taxis of the Holy Mountain, "[the priests] exit the sanctuary at a slow pace, distribute light from their candles to the people," but without chanting "Come receive the light . . .."[10]

From all these witnesses of the manuscript tradition, the path seems quite clear along which the formation of this element of the service of Pascha followed, up until when it attained its present form. In all of them, we saw the attempt to highlight the illumination of the lights of the temple and the candles of the faithful from the light of the Resurrection of Christ, so that in this way the contrast of our changeover from darkness and the shadow of death to the marvelous and brilliant light of the Resurrection might be strongly presented. We can say that the service up until this point has reached an ideal form and vividly expresses that which the Church wanted to portray through this practice. It is not also expressly mentioned in the manuscripts and printed Typika and Pentēkostaria that they extinguish the lights beforehand, but the lighting of lamps, candles, tapers, and so forth, which is prescribed by all of them, means that beforehand, either they were already out, or they were extinguished before the enarxis of the service of the Resurrection. So much for the first part of the question.

However, as for the second question, matters are completely different. The chanting of the seventh eōthinon doxastikon is not prescribed at this time in any manuscript or printed Typikon or Pentēkostarion. As is well known, the seventh eōthinon doxastikon is a poetic reprise of the seventh eōthinon gospel (John 20:1–11) which describes the confirmation during Sunday morning by the two apostles, Peter and John, of the news from Magdalēnē that the tomb of the Lord was empty, namely, an event which has no relation

10. "Δεῦτε λάβετε φῶς . . ."

with either one of the two gospels that are traditionally read during the service of the Resurrection, nor also immediately after this event that we will shortly recollect. This was introduced lately by certain persons inclined toward innovations, where the phrase, "Behold, the darkness and the dawn . . . ,"[11] which is a reprise of, "comes at dawn when it was still dark" from the gospel (John 20:1), attracted them in connection with the darkness that prevails in the temple after the extinguishing of the lights and before the lighting of the lights in it. There exists no doubt that this is a beautiful troparion and that its musical accentuation is beautiful. There are also other equally beautiful and melodic troparia that could be chanted. But the temple and the service of the all-night vigil provide neither a suitable place nor an opportune time. During the resurrection period, on the initiative and under the oversight of the priest, the choirs of chanters could perform a selection of these marvelous and melodious hymns for the people in a suitable hall, but not at midnight of Pascha before the people, who are standing and weary. Aside from this, the all-night vigil has its own hymns prescribed by the Typikon—the resurrectional apolytikion of the second tone, "When you descended unto death . . .,"[12] which is marvelous and excellently adapted for the occasion (which concludes the Midnight Office of Pascha), "Come, receive the light . . .,"[13] "Angels in the heavens, O Christ our Savior . . .,"[14] the canon of Pascha, and so forth. The inherited taxis must not be disturbed by individual initiatives taken certainly from good intentions, but we must try to employ the elements that it allots to us in abundance.

11. "Ἰδοὺ σκοτία καὶ πρωΐ . . ."
12. "Ὅτε κατῆλθες πρὸς τὸν θάνατον . . ."
13. "Δεῦτε λάβετε φῶς . . ."
14. "Τὴν ἀνάστασίν σου . . ."

153

What orientation must the icons of the proskynētaria have, which are usually located on the right and the left of the central entrance of the temple? Must the icons face west, or does it make no difference?

The standard position for the proskynētaria, which are placed near the entrance of the temple or before the iconostasis, is similar to the position of the icons of the templon. In this manner, the faithful when entering venerate while facing east according to the custom handed down from the Forefathers. The proskynētaria on the Holy Mountain also have this orientation, where they are set up in the litē, namely, in the inner narthēx, and before the templon.[15]

Despite this, in some temples the position of the proskynētaria is not as above, especially in temples of small dimensions, built during the era of the Tourkokratia,[16] or in others in which the entrance for the faithful for various reasons does not take place by the central western door, but from a side door, usually one facing south. In that case, for the convenience of the faithful and the avoidance of commotion and aimless movement in the temple, the proskynētaria are located as need dictates, namely, facing north or south. The same

15. The word "λιτή" is used here in the sense of "λιτὴ ναοῦ," a monastic addition to the narthēx. See Sotiris Voyadjis, "Column-supported Narthexes–Lites in Monastic Architecture," *Δελτίον τῆς Χριστιανικῆς Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας* 33 (2012): 54,

The wide narthex supported on columns, called *lite* from the respective monastic office held in this space, essentially comprises an annex to the body of the church. It provided important additional space to the nave, wherever it was used, that fulfilled needs beyond conducting the *lite* office, such as accommodating the worshippers, who under certain circumstances could not fit in the main church. Thus, the *lite* provides flexibility to the church since it can be isolated from it or be connected to it, e.g., for a liturgy requiring less heating. In addition, it was often the case that a *lite* was added or a narrow narthex was extended when a monastery became well-known and attracted more people, even though the form of the Divine Liturgy had certainly not changed. Finally, it seems to have housed the need for accommodating catechumens on the floor above. Recent research has shown that this space seems to have constituted the residence of an important person, usually the founder of the monastery.

16. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

thing again also happens for reasons of physical necessity, when an object of veneration, for example, a saint's tomb, a reliquary, an icon embedded within a wall, and so forth, occupies a permanent position within the temple, which does not have, and this happens often, the traditional orientation. The veneration then takes place all the same, in accordance with the location of the object of veneration. As examples, I refer to the tomb of Blessed Athanasios of Athos in the Great Lavra of the Holy Mountain and of Saint Grēgorios V in the metropolitan temple of Athens, where their veneration takes place by the faithful facing north; of Saint Theōnas in the Monastery of Saint Anastasia of Chalkidikē, of Blessed Christodoulos in Patmos, and of the Archangel at Mantamados on Lesbos, where their veneration takes place by the faithful facing south; and of the Panagia "Quick to hear"[17] of the Monastery of Docheiariou on the Holy Mountain, where the veneration occurs facing west. But apart from these special cases and apart from the iconographic depictions of temple frescos, which are pointed in every direction, both in many old parish temples and in monasteries, especially also on the Holy Mountain, which is the ark of our Church's traditions, they also had the custom of locating proskynētaria with portable icons pointed in every direction, especially around the columns of the temple. The position that worshippers take is analogous to the position of the icon.

In summarizing we can say that the standard position for the proskynētaria is such that the icons ought to face west, in order that the veneration of the faithful is given facing east, but, if special circumstances impose it, their placement in a different manner is not something forbidden, but on the contrary, quite frequently encountered.

17. "Γοργοεπηκόου."

154

When the saint being celebrated might have a doxastikon at the stichēra and is lacking aposticha and their doxastikon, then what type of Vespers is it, Small or Great, and must an entrance take place during it?[18]

An entrance takes place during the service of Vespers only when the saint celebrated might have a full service and the relevant rubric in the Mēnaia clearly describes that an "entrance" takes place during the Vespers for this saint. Additionally, when a saint is locally celebrated on his/her feast or there is a saint in the name of whom the temple is dedicated, and a full service does not exist in the Mēnaion or even is completely omitted, as is the case with all the commemorations of the new martyrs, but the Mēnaion's service is supplemented by special service books,[19] again an entrance takes place during Vespers. Consequently, in the case the question mentions, no entrance would take place.

This Vespers falls under the ordinary weekday Vespers without an entrance. The terms, "Small" and "Great" Vespers, strictly have to do only with the Vespers of all-night vigils of Sundays, great feasts, and great saints, during the commemorations of which an all-night vigil is celebrated in the monasteries. These adjectives are used for a distinction between two services of Vespers, which are celebrated on these days in monasteries, the "Small" at the customary hour of Ves-

---

18. See also questions 131, 173, 174, 279, 295, 341, 342, 343, 369, 404, 421, 560, and 595.

19. φυλλάδες. According to Phountoulēs, Γεράσιμος Μικραγιαννανίτης (Gerasimos Mikragiannanitēs) (1905–1991), a monk of the Skete of Small Saint Anna on the Holy Mountain and one of the most important hymnographers of modern times, "alone wrote two thousand such services and countless troparia, apolytikia, kontakia, megalynaria, and so forth" (see question 595 for additional information on these "special service books"). He was recognized with the title, "Hymnographer of the Great Church of Christ." For basic bibliography, see Π.Β. Πάσχος, *'Υμνηπόλος Ἐράσμιος': Ὁ Ὑμνογράφος τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας Γέρασιμος Μοναχὸς Μικραγιαννανίτης* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Σκήτη Μικρὰς Ἁγίας Ἄννης, 1992) and Θεόκλητος Μοναχὸς Διονυσιάτης, *Γέρασιμος Μοναχὸς Μικραγιαννανίτης, Ὑμνογράφος τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: 'Οργανισμὸς Πολιτιστικῆς Πρωτεύουσας τῆς Εὐρώπης, Ἱερὰ Κοινότητα Ἁγίου Ὄρους, 1997).

pers conjoined with the service of the Ninth Hour and the "Great" during the all-night vigil. In parishes, in these cases, the "Small" Vespers is omitted and only the "Great" is performed.

As for the troparia to be chanted, the Vespers services for weekdays present sufficient variety, consistent with the level of honor for the saint during the era of their composition and the place in which the hymnographer lived. We have full Vespers with an entrance, others with stichēra and aposticha, with doxastika, or even only with three stichēra and a theotokion. All of these variations belong to the category of the common or weekday Vespers.

See also the relevant points in the answer to question sixty-seven.

155

If the newly illumined baby does not have sufficient hair for the priest to be able to perform the tonsuring, can this be performed later and the relevant prayers read at that time, or must it necessarily be performed together with the baptism?

The majority of and the most ancient manuscripts that contain the service of holy baptism place the prayers of tonsure immediately after the service of washing, exactly as late manuscripts and the present printed editions, without prescribing whether both these services took place at the same time on the same day, namely, the eighth day after baptism, or if the tonsure was performed later. Also, from this absence of a relevant rubric, the allusion in the first prayer ("your servant . . . who approaches to make a first-fruit offering the cutting of the hair of his/her head"), and the whole aim of the service, it becomes clear that the tonsure was not performed immediately after baptism, nor even immediately after the washing. When the newly illumined was going to "have the hair of his/her head cut" for the first time after baptism, he/she came to the temple at an unfixed time and the priest symbolically cut his/her hair and read the prayers of tonsure. However, this service was also directly related to all the baptismal rites and in some manner constituted a conclusion of them all.

In a later era, for various reasons, the tendency became prevalent for all the prebaptismal and postbaptismal rites to be gathered into one single service, something that also takes place nowadays. At first, it seems that the service of tonsure was united with baptism, while the washing remained to be performed on the eighth day after baptism. The first witness we have on this is from a codex of the thirteenth century, *National Library of Athens 670.* According to this codex, the tonsure took place before the dismissal of baptism. For practical reasons later, as also nowadays, the tonsure took place immediately after chrismation and before the dressing of the newly illumined. During the fifteenth century, this is attested to by Symeōn of Thessaloniki (*Dialogue*, chapter 67)[20] and the *Codex Athens 664.* This also became prevalent. However, from the rubric of a manuscript of the fifteenth century, *National Library of Athens 1910*, we conclude that this was also not absolutely obligatory, since it left to the discretion of the priest to perform the tonsure at that time or not: "But if he wishes to tonsure the child at the same time it was baptized, after saying, 'Seal of the gift . . .,' immediately he tonsured it."

From the above, we conclude that the tonsure was performed apart from the baptism, especially when special reasons intervened, such as that which the questioner cites. Not only does this not oppose the ancient practice and aim of this service, but on the contrary, we could say that in this way matters are placed in their correct and logical sequence. However, since, for five centuries and more, as we saw, it became prevalent for the tonsure to be performed in connection with holy baptism and its postponement would cause trouble,[21] and would not be consistent with prevailing practice, and neither would add anything special to the appearance and development of this service—since this would take place only in very rare cases—I hold the opinion that it must not be delayed. I think that even in the worst case, the priest would find even some traces of hair to cut during this symbolic tonsure.

20. PG 155:229d–232b.

21. The clause here, "πράγματα θὰ παρεῖχε," is an uncommon expression and its translation as "cause trouble" is based on LSJ (s.v. "πρᾶγμα, ατος, τό").

156

Is the cutting of an unbaptized baby's hair by its mother permitted, and if not, as it is believed by many, why?

The matter is completely indifferent. The ancient Christians who were baptized at an old age naturally cut their hair whenever they wanted. In the same way, it is not also possible for children being baptized at a somewhat old age to retain their hair for months in order for them to cut it after baptism.

The meaning of the tonsure is not that the baby offers the first hairs of its head to God, but rather that it offers to Him its first hair after baptism "as a first-fruit and sacrifice," according to Symeōn of Thessaloniki, of its whole body. Symeōn analyzes this beautifully, "[The priest] cuts the hairs of his head in crosswise manner, partly both on account of having Christ as head and being obliged to pray uncovered, as also Paul teaches,[22] and partly making this as a seal [the tonsure], since he cuts him in a crosswise manner, in order that he may cast away any unnecessary thoughts, for which reason also the monks are tonsured. Any believer also ought to cast away the unnecessary and ought not to refrain from such a thing in practice. Besides, the hairs are offered to Christ by the one being baptized as a first fruit and sacrifice of the human body; for they are as a rising exhalation of the entire body" (*Dialogue*, chapter 67).[23]

The custom that the questioner refers to certainly is derived from a misunderstanding of the meaning of tonsure in an era where it had become prevalent for children to be baptized at a very early age and in any case the need for cutting their hair before holy baptism did not exist.

22. 1 Cor 11:3–4.
23. PG 155:232c.

157

Why does the Typikon not permit the celebration of the Divine Liturgy on December 23rd and 22nd if the Great Hours are chanted on these days? Can the Liturgy of Chrysostomos be celebrated on these days and in what manner?

As is well known, the practice now in force is broken down as follows: On the eves of the Nativity and Theophany, after the service of Matins, the service of the Great and Royal Hours for the feast is performed, and Vespers and the Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great follows. However, when the feast of the Nativity or Theophany coincides with a Sunday or Monday, the service of the Great Hours of the eve is not celebrated on the eve, which respectively should be Saturday or Sunday, but on the nearest fasting day, namely, Friday, for the Nativity on December 23rd or 22nd, and for Theophany on January 4th or 3rd. If this happens, the Great Vespers of the feast, conjoined with the Liturgy of Basileios the Great,[24] is not performed, but Vespers is performed as normal on the eve of the feast, and the Liturgy of Basileios the Great on the day of the feast instead of the Liturgy of Chrysostomos. According to the standard rubrics in force, no Liturgy is celebrated, not even that of Chrysostomos, on the days to which the Great Hours are transferred.

The question is why on these days is the celebration of the Liturgy not permitted. The question is quite difficult and complicated. The answer must be sought in two related directions. The first is the parallel with Great Friday and the second is the fasting on these days.

It is clear that the preparatory period for the Nativity and Theophany has been fashioned in imitation of the period of Great Lent and especially of Great Week. A fast of forty days precedes the Nativity, just as also Pascha. The forefeast canons, the diōdion and the triōdia of the Nativity and Theophany, which are chanted at Compline, have been composed in imitation of the corresponding hymns of Great Week and indeed maintain not only the same acrostics,[25]

24. In other words, Vesperal Divine Liturgy.

25. "ἀκροστιχίς," a poetic device wherein the initial letter of each troparion of a canon together spell out a message.

even though the chanting of them did not coincide with these days of the week ("On Tuesday,"[26] "On Wednesday I chant,"[27] "On long Thursday I sing out a long hymn,"[28] and so forth), but also many phrases from the corresponding troparia. The service of Great Hours has been composed according to the model of the Great Hours of Great Friday, as it appears both from the inspiration and the whole schēma of these services and from the similarities in the idiomela ("Today the curtain of the temple . . ."[29]—"Today the nature of the waters is sanctified . . ."[30] and "As a sheep led to slaughter . . ."[31]—"As a man in the river . . ."[32] of the First Hour; "Before your precious cross . . ."[33]—"Before your birth . . ."[34] and "Drawn upon the cross . . ."[35]—"Coming with flesh . . ."[36] of the Third Hour; "Thus says the Lord to the Jews . . ."[37]—"Thus says the Lord to John . . ."[38] and "Come, O Christ-bearing peoples, let us look at what counsel was taken . . ."[39]—"Come, O Christ-bearing peoples, let us look at a wonder . . ."[40] of the Sixth Hour, and so forth). With the service of the Great Hours, these two eves are placed in a position parallel to Great Friday.

Great Friday is a day of strict fasting. Both these days are the same. On days of strict fasting, it is well known that the Divine Liturgy is not performed, and this is because fasting and Liturgy are two incompatible things. Liturgy means communion and communion is a union with the Bridegroom. "The sons of the Bridegroom" are not able to fast "during the time the Bridegroom is with them"

26. "Τρίτῃ τε."
27. "Τετράδι ψαλῶ."
28. "Τῇ μακρᾷ Πέμπτῃ μακρὸν ὕμνον ἐξάδω."
29. "Σήμερον τοῦ ναοῦ τὸ καταπέτασμα . . ."
30. "Σήμερον τῶν ὑδάτων ἁγιάζεται ἡ φύσις . . ."
31. "Ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγήν . . ."
32. "Ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐν ποταμῷ . . ."
33. "Πρὸ τοῦ τιμίου σου σταυροῦ . . ."
34. "Πρὸ τῆς γεννήσεως τῆς σῆς . . ."
35. "Ἑλκόμενος ἐπὶ σταυροῦ . . ."
36. "Ἐρχόμενος μετὰ σαρκός."
37. "Τάδε λέγει Κύριος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις . . ."
38. "Τάδε λέγει Κύριος πρὸς Ἰωάννην . . ."
39. "Δεῦτε χριστοφόροι λαοὶ κατίδωμεν τί συνεβουλεύσατο . . ."
40. "Δεῦτε χριστοφόροι λαοὶ κατίδωμεν θαῦμα . . ."

(Matt 9:15, Mark 2:19–20, Luke 5:34–35). On these days, the Liturgy is performed either after Vespers, just as on Great Saturday, or a Presanctified is performed on these days, again, connected with Vespers, as on the days of Great Lent. Also, on the days of the great fast of the eves of the Nativity and of Theophany, the Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great after Vespers is performed in imitation of Great Saturday. Now when the Great Hours of the eve of the Nativity are transferred together with the fasting to December 22nd or 23rd, the Liturgy of Chrysostomos is not celebrated on them, because the morning Liturgy would presuppose the conclusion along with it of the fasting; but also neither the Liturgy of Basileios the Great, because this is connected with the Vespers of the feast, which is performed now on the evening of the eve, which is its standard place; however, without the Liturgy of Basileios the Great because the eve is Saturday or Sunday, namely, not a fasting day, and consequently, the Liturgy was performed in the morning.[41] Regarding the eve of Theophany, what was in force appears to be the same with the difference that since January 2nd and 3rd fall in a period during which fasting is prohibited, consumption of everything occurs on these days.

Perhaps we could invoke yet another probable reason. These days ought to remain unconcerned with any other festal celebration apart from the central theme that is highlighted on these days, the Birth and Baptism of the Lord, and as such they lacked the Divine Liturgy in order to keep the center of gravity for the entire celebration in the Great Hours of these feasts. But this is much less probable. The Divine Liturgy remained always connected with whatever celebration, without this being seen as a detraction, but rather on the contrary was seen as a climax of the day's festal event. Perhaps the Liturgy was removed in order to shorten the length of the service. However, this is also not a strong reason. During the era of the formation of the Typika, a service of such a sort was also not considered very long. Other even more extensive services existed.

41. The reason for the Presanctified and Vesperal Liturgies was based on the ancient practice of fasting, namely, the complete refraining from any food until the ninth hour.

However, I very much fear that the prohibition of the celebration of the Divine Liturgy of Chrysostomos on these days is due to a misunderstanding or to an excessive influence of the parallel with Great Friday. In all the ancient Typika, insofar as at least I know, mention is made only of the fact that during the transfer of great feasts, the Liturgy of Basileios the Great is not celebrated on these days. Concerning the prohibition of the Liturgy of Chrysostomos, no mention is made anywhere.

Moreover, two practical reasons would speak in favor for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy of Chrysostomos on the eves of the Nativity. The first is the commemoration of Saint Anastasia the One who cures wounds[42] (December 22), who is especially honored in many places and the faithful assemble for her commemoration in temples and indeed in those temples dedicated in her name. The second reason is communion of the faithful, and indeed of the children, who approach *en masse* on the eves of the Nativity for holy communion. And the second can be addressed if as many of the Christians who do not know are notified in a timely manner that the Divine Liturgy is not celebrated on these days. However, the first reason is much more difficult. A commemoration of a saint on his/her feast day without the Divine Liturgy—since indeed his/her commemoration is not transferred, but his/her troparia are chanted at Vespers and Matins—would be inconceivable. I know cases where the Liturgy of Chrysostomos is celebrated on these days by many priests in temples celebrating their feast days or for the communion of the faithful, on the basis of an old tradition and despite the prohibition of the Typikon. In that case, the Liturgy ought to take place normally after the Sixth Hour, just as it should take place on the other days of the year, or after the Ninth Hour, as modern Typika provide for the feast of the Annunciation when it coincides with Great Friday. However, I think it would be preferable for it to be performed before the Hours, joined with Matins and, after the communion of the multitudes is concluded, afterwards the Great Hours are performed with fitting order and majesty, as the most

42. "φαρμακολύτρια," (Lampe, s.v. "φαρμακολύτρια, ἡ"). However, the epithet can also be translated, "Deliverer from Poisons" or "Deliverer from Potions."

ancient Typika provide in the instance above for the coinciding of Great Friday and the Annunciation.

Nevertheless, inasmuch as the Typikon in force appoints no Liturgy to be performed on these days, until this issue is cleared up, the observance of its rubric should be recommended, even though this does not appear either completely justified or attested to by the ancient practice, and only by permission of the hierarch is the Liturgy of Chrysostomos to be performed in temples celebrating their feast days.

158

On the day of Theophany, Christians partake of the Great Hagiasmos. Is it permitted for them to drink of it on this day or only to bless their homes and property? After some time, many return it to the church. What must we do in this case?

We have repeatedly dealt with the service of the Great Hagiasmos in connection with other questions (see questions 31, 35, 79, 126, and 136). We return again in connection with the two-fold question of the reverend priest.

It is true that the Church always encompassed the Great Hagiasmos with special piety, precisely because of the special sacredness of the rite, which is performed in remembrance of the Baptism of the Lord during the celebration of the event. Although it is not included among the seven mysteries, its relationship to the blessing of the water of holy baptism makes it equivalent to the latter; also, for this reason, the blessing was considered "second to holy communion" (according to the *Codex Sinai 978*) and it was given, just as nowadays, in place of holy communion to the faithful who had some impediment regarding the latter. This emphasis on the sacredness of the service led, indeed out of piety, to certain excesses, among which is the one referenced by the question. At the very least, this excess could be characterized as peculiar and there would be no need for us to dwell on it, since it is clear that it does not correspond to reality. However, this is quite widespread, and we must not ignore it since this becomes a cause for many of the faithful to be deprived

of the Hagiasmos that is offered through this service, and thus is opposed to the goal of its celebration.

We shall derive our information from the diaconal litanies and the prayers of the service itself and from the practice and taxis of the Church that is expressed in the standard rubrics, which accompany the service in various codices. We must always seek the goal and purpose of each service in its texts, from the interpretation of which we derive information that is indispensable to us for its understanding. Thus, we know the "goal of the Church" according to Symeōn of Thessaloniki (*Explanation,* 94).[43] Every tradition or theory that does not agree with or is contrary to the texts, must be rejected out of necessity.

The question is whether Christians must drink the Great Hagiasmos on the day of Theophany. On this subject, the texts are so clear that there is no room for doubt. In the special litany of peace for the service of the Great Hagiasmos, *inter alia*, there are two characteristic petitions: "That this [water] may be for a purification of souls and bodies for all who draw on it with faith and partake of it . . ."[44] and "That we be vouchsafed to be filled with sanctification through partaking of these waters by the invisible visitation of the Holy Spirit . . .."[45] Besides these, in the manuscripts there are a multitude of similar petitions: "That these [waters] may be to all who are anointed with them and partake for a purification from defilement of the flesh and spirit . . ."[46] (*Sinai 958*), "That this [water] may be for all who make use of it in faith and partake for a purification . . ."[47] (*National Library of Athens 664, 1910, 2573, 2724*), "That these [waters] may be for all who are anointed and partake of them for a pu-

43. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika,* 151.

44. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ γενέσθαι αὐτὸ (τὸ ὕδωρ) πρὸς καθαρισμὸν ψυχῶν καὶ σωμάτων, πᾶσι τοῖς ἀρυομένοις πίστει, καὶ μεταλαμβάνουσιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ . . ."

45. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ καταξιωθῆναι ἡμᾶς ἐμπλησθῆναι ἁγιασμοῦ, διὰ τῆς τῶν ὑδάτων τούτων μεταλήψεως τῇ ἀοράτῳ ἐπιφανείᾳ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος . . ."

46. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ γενέσθαι αὐτὰ πᾶσι τοῖς χριομένοις ἐξ αὐτῶν καὶ μεταλαμβάνουσιν εἰς καθαρισμὸν μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος . . ."

47. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ γενέσθαι αὐτὸ πᾶσι τοῖς χρωμένοις ἐξ αὐτοῦ πίστει καὶ μεταλαμβάνουσιν εἰς καθαρισμόν . . ."

rification . . ."[48] (*National Library of Athens 64, 877*), "That we may be illumined by partaking of it . . ."[49] (*Athens 64*), "That it may be for those who partake of it and are anointed for healing of soul and body . . ."[50] (*Athens 685*), and so forth. The prayers are equally clear. Thus, in the sanctification prayer, "Great are you, O Lord . . .,"[51] we read "That all who draw from and partake of it may have it for a purification of souls and bodies . . ."[52] and further down, "Grant sanctification, blessing, cleansing, and health to all who touch, are anointed, and partake."[53] Moreover, in the prayer of inclination, "Incline your ear, O Lord . . .,"[54] there is a similar phrase: "and deem us worthy to be filled with your sanctification by both the partaking and sprinkling of this water."[55]

However, perhaps the objection could be presented that the prayers speak about partaking of the Hagiasmos not on the day of Theophany, but after it, in the case of partaking of it instead of holy communion on the other days of the year. However, from the standard rubrics of the manuscripts we are also enlightened regarding this subject. All the codices that contain the service offer a clear rationale for the faithful's partaking of Hagiasmos, indeed even before antidōron. We gather some characteristic witnesses: "After the priest has filled the vessels of the church from the holy water fount . . . he begins to sprinkle the people from the water, next in this manner he tastes of it after consuming the Holy Elements and also gives it to the people . . ." (*Turin 216*), "he tastes and also gives it to the people . . ." (*Sinai 966*), "and all who are baptized by the

48. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ γενέσθαι αὐτὰ πᾶσι τοῖς χριομένοις καὶ μεταλαμβάνουσιν ἐξ αὐτῶν εἰς καθαρισμόν . . ."

49. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ φωτισθῆναι ἡμᾶς τῇ αὐτοῦ μεταλήψει . . ."

50. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ γενέσθαι τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ χριομένοις εἰς ἴασιν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος . . ."

51. "Μέγας εἶ, Κύριε, καὶ θαυμαστὰ τὰ ἔργα σου . . ."

52. "Ἵνα πάντες οἱ ἁρυόμενοι καὶ μεταλαμβάνοντες ἔχοιεν αὐτὸ πρὸς καθαρισμὸν ψυχῶν καὶ σωμάτων . . ."

53. "Δὸς πᾶσι τοῖς ἁπτομένοις, τοῖς τε χριομένοις, τοῖς τε μεταλαμβάνουσιν τὸν ἁγιασμόν, τὴν εὐλογίαν, τὴν κάθαρσιν, τὴν ὑγείαν."

54. "Κλῖνον, Κύριε, τὸ οὖς σου . . ."

55. "καὶ καταξίωσον ἡμᾶς ἐμπλησθῆναι τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ σου διὰ τῆς τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου μεταλήψεώς τε καὶ ῥαντισμοῦ . . ."

water sprinkled and drunk . . ." (*Sinai 1096*), "when all are sanctified by and partake of the sharing and sprinkling of the Hagiasmos . . ." (*Athens 788*),[56] "when all are sanctified by and partake of these divine sanctified waters and make full use of sharing and sprinkling . . ." (*Athens 2724*), "when all partake of and are sanctified by the sprinkling of the water . . ." (*National Library of Athens 64, 662, 754, 1910, 2573*), and so forth.

Also, one further element from the contemporary practice of the monasteries of the Holy Mountain: The monks, as is well known, can be characterized as anything but innovators or impious. Thus, they commune of the Great Hagiasmos not only on the day of Theophany, but according to their custom they drink Hagiasmos every day after the Divine Liturgy, and they also partake of it throughout the octave up until the leavetaking of the feast. In another instance, we mentioned the ancient practice of the faithful keeping it in their homes throughout the entire year and making use of it "for purification of soul and body, for cure of the passions, for sanctification of homes, for every suitable benefit," according to the prayer.

As for the return of sanctified water, I do not see the reason for which this takes place. Let it be recommended to the faithful either to drink it or to sprinkle their homes and properties[57] on the day of Theophany, inasmuch as on the remaining days "in general it is not thrown away" according to the rubric of the *Codex Sinai 978* and the pious custom even prevailing nowadays.

56. See questions 456–457 for a fuller quotation of the text.

57. The word, "τὰ κτήματα," can refer to farmlands, fields, orchards, and plots of land. In these cases, the sprinkling of the sanctified water would be done for favorable crops.

159

When one of the parish priests serves two parishes during the period of Great Lent, is it correct for him to perform Vespers on Friday evening in his second parish given that he wishes to celebrate the Liturgy on Saturday, or is the Vespers with the Presanctified that he has already performed on Friday morning in his other parish sufficient?

The service of Vespers as well as also all the other services of the daily cycle (Midnight Office, Matins, Hours, and Compline) are not connected with a certain temple, nor do they constitute preparatory services, as often said, for the Divine Liturgy. Each one of these services is complete and separate and is connected with the Christian community or monastic brotherhood that celebrates it and not with one place or another. As we have written elsewhere, the Divine Liturgy is itself a separate service that is performed independently in any temple, regardless of whether or not the other separate services of the daily cycle have been celebrated in it. The obligation of attendance falls on the community or at least the priest alone. From the strict practice of the monasteries, we have the characteristic witness for the correctness of this view. Vespers and Matins are always performed in the central temple of the monasteries, the katholikon. Compline is usually in a chapel or privately, "in the cells." The First of the Hours is appended to Matins and read in the katholikon, the Third and Sixth precede the Divine Liturgy, and the Ninth is said again in the katholikon before Vespers. If it is not Sunday or a feast, the Divine Liturgy is usually performed in the chapels, in which none of the other services are performed. Besides, the Divine Liturgy is not always performed, while the other services are performed daily and consequently it is not logical for us to contend that we perform them as a preparation for the Liturgy.

Since then, according to the question, the priest already performed the Vespers of the day, whether it was combined with the Presanctified or not, he would not also repeat the same service in another temple, even if he was about to perform the Divine Liturgy the following day in this temple.

160

Is the burial of a priest permitted in the grave of his presbytera[58]?

161

Is the interment of a lay person permitted in the grave in which a clergyman has been interred, as well as the interment of a lay person in the grave of a presbytera?

Customarily, priests have their own graves that are found behind the holy bēma of cemetery temples, or near them, if the location of the temple does not provide suitable space behind its apse.[59] Then of course other persons are not buried in these special graves, not because any special provision requires this, nor any theoretical reason, but because ecclesiastical custom, out of reverence for the persons of celebrants of the holy altar, prescribed this special posthumous distinction regarding their burial, also so consistent with their office. However, in large cities, this is not always possible, and priests are buried without distinction in the graves of laymen, and vice versa, or they are laid in their family graves. Again, there also exists no barrier in this regard. In any event, this also takes place nowadays on the Holy Mountain, where priests and monks are buried without distinction in any grave whatsoever, and this also occured in the ancient era, as archaeological finds show us. We have two characteristic examples from the catacombs of Milos. As their inscriptions attest, two tombs belong to clergymen. In the first, three presbyters, one deaconess, two virgins and their mother have been laid ("The presbyters who are worthy of all memory, Asklēpis / and Elpizōn and Asklēpiodōros and Agalliasis / a deaconess and Eutychia who lived a virgin life and Klaudianē / who lived a virgin life and Eutychia, their mother/ lie here . . ."). In the second one, the presbyter probably buried his daughter, and intended to bury himself, his presbytera,

58. The wife of a priest.

59. In Greece, public cemeteries are generally regarded as sacred grounds, often where a chapel is located, and interments in these graveyards are administered by the state and the Orthodox Church.

and his children in it ("Here lies Stephanis daughter of the priest Mēlōn. / I adjure you mothers of the congregation in the name of Christ / that you do not lay here anyone other than me / the presbyter Mēlōn and his children and spouse").

Although, out of respect to custom, I think it would be preferable, where there exist special graves, only for priests to be buried in them.

Almost the same applies to presbyteres.[60] If there is no canonical distinction regarding the burial of priests, much more would there not be regarding the place for burial of them as well.

162

In the case of a funeral or memorial service of a priest or hierarch, would the deacon say at the petitions, and the priest in the prayer, "who had been our concelebrant"[61] or will he say only "[name] the priest"[62] or "[name] the hierarch"[63]?

As is well known, nowadays, the funeral service "for laity"[64] is also conducted for priests and bishops "fallen asleep" and only the special prayer is added to it, "We give thanks to you, O Lord our God, that you alone live immortal . . .,"[65] in which there is the phrase, "your servant and priest [or, hierarch] [name] who had been our concelebrant."[66] There is also no question regarding these prayers. These are always said by the priest and the phrase, "who had been our concelebrant,"[67] is fitting in his mouth not only for the priest's identical rank, but also for the hierarch, who is himself the priest's

60. The wives of priests.

61. "συλλειτουργοῦ ἡμῶν γενομένου."

62. "δεῖνα ἱερέως." The Greek word, δεῖνα (so-and-so), is often parenthetically inserted as a placeholder in prayers and petitions where specific name(s) can be inserted. In the present translation, the word "name" has been used to translate this word.

63. "δεῖνα ἀρχιερέως."

64. "εἰς κοσμικούς."

65. "Εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι, Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὅτι σοῦ μόνον τὸ ζῆν ἀθάνατον . . ."

66. "τὸν δοῦλόν σου καὶ συλλειτουργὸν ἡμῶν γενόμενον [τὸν δεῖνα] ἱερέα [ἢ ἀρχιερέα]."

67. "συλλειτουργὸν ἡμῶν γενόμενον."

concelebrant. The same would also apply for the petitions if they were said by the priest. But these are also said by the deacon or rather are only said by him and improperly, in the absence of a deacon, are also said by the priest. So then, would it be proper for the deacon to call the priest or even the hierarch a "concelebrant"?

In the manuscripts and in printed Euchologia, there is a special service "for a priest who has died," common to priests and hierarchs, which in the manuscripts presents many variations, and is one of the longest and most rich services of our Euchologia. In the service, special diaconal petitions do not exist for the priest, but even here the usual diaconal litanies from the ordinary funeral service are provided to be said, with the only difference that the status of the one "fallen asleep" is added to the name, in other words, "[name] the priest" or "the hierarch." Only in certain manuscripts, do there exist apart from the special prayers and other elements of the service, also special diaconal supplications, which clearly indicates that they are said by the deacon or also the priest (*Patmos 646, Esphigmenou 214, Hagiou Saba 373*). In these, the phrase "and our concelebrant" exists. The deacon even here calls the priests and hierarchs his concelebrants. This should not surprise us. The fact that the deacons are characterized as concelebrants of the priest is also apparent from the Divine Liturgy. In the well-known dialogue between the priest and deacon after the great entrance and the placement of the precious gifts on the holy table, does not the priest address the deacon with the phrase, "Remember me, brother and concelebrant"[68]? Does not this dialogue also conclude with the prayer, "The same Holy Spirit shall concelebrate with us [namely, together with the priest and deacon] all the days of our life"[69]?

However, the difficulty does not exist regarding the diaconal petitions that are said nowadays in funerals and memorial services for priests or hierarchs. In these, the phrase, "who had been our concelebrant" will not be added, but only the name of the one fallen asleep with the specification of his priestly status. "Concelebrant"

68. "Μνήσθητί μου, ἀδελφὲ καὶ συλλειτουργέ."
69. "Αὐτὸ τὸ Πνεῦμα συλλειτουργήσει ἡμῖν πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν."

only exists in the special prayer, but as we have written, this is said by the priest, the indisputable concelebrant of the one fallen asleep.

163

Some of the Christians summon the priest to read the prayer of vaskania[70] for the unbaptized infant during the first days from its birth, in order that he/she is not influenced by the evil eye[71] in its life. In this case, is it permitted for the prayer to be read for unbaptized children or not? What must be the priest's position when Christians insist in this case and in other similar cases?

In the answer to question number fifty-four, we wrote that unbaptized infants do not partake in the mysteries since they are not members of the Church, but they can receive the prayers of the Church as "catechumens" and especially the exorcisms, which were always read to the catechumens. Already in the prayer of the first day from birth, there is mention of "eyes of malignity,"[72] from which the protection of the baby is sought. When sickness coincides, there exists nothing that impedes the prayer of vaskania from then being read to the baby, inasmuch as it is not a mystery and certainly since it is a type of exorcism.

However, it is not permitted for the priest to read the relevant prayer if there does not exist an actual reason, and to become an accomplice and to encourage the superstitions of simple-minded faithful. The prayer of vaskania does not possess the character of an anti-vaskania vaccine. However, the illumination of Christians must take place in a systematic and timely way so that they know the significance, the purpose, and the power of the liturgical prayers and the various services. Otherwise, why should we seek responsibility from irresponsible, but well-meaning people? Let each priest question his conscience as to whether he is not himself responsible for the darkness in which his "rational sheep" still live. Neither much

70. The term vaskania (βασκανία) is sometimes translated "evil eye," but can also be understood as a malignant influence or desire upon someone, or even a jealousy.

71. "μὴ ματιάζεται."

72. "ὀφθαλμῶν βασκανίας."

wisdom nor great rhetorical abilities are required for this effort. The faithful should be illumined without delay because, with something like these kinds of superstitions, our Church's means of sanctification are disparaged and desecrated, and we become a cause for our spiritual worship to be slandered and to be considered by many as synonymous with magic and superstition.

164

In the sacred Gospel book as well as in the Apostolos on Wednesday and Friday of Cheesefare Week, why is neither a gospel pericope nor an epistle reading indicated? Why is a Liturgy not performed on these days, and in the event of an absolute necessity for its celebration, what reading shall be read and why?

According to the rubrics of the prevailing Typikon and of the Triōdion, a Liturgy is not performed, either complete or Presanctified, on Wednesday and Friday of Cheesefare Week. And while the Typikon of the Great Church of Christ (Kōnstantinos[73] and Violakēs[74]) in a footnote vaguely attributes this custom to the tradition of "the holy Fathers," the Triōdion does so more correctly to the tradition of Palestine ("Note that in Palestine we have not received through the holy Fathers to perform a complete or Presanctified Liturgy on Wednesday or Friday of Cheesefare"). This rubric of the Triōdion precisely suggests that the tradition of other regions must have been different and that ultimately the Palestinian tradition became prevalent. Moreover, the Triōdion as well as the Typikon, as it is well known, reflect the liturgical tradition of Jerusalem and especially the Monastery of Saint Sabas.[75] Older manuscript Typika,

73. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 212, n. (α).

74. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 322–323, n. 4.

75. In discussing the liturgical Typikon in general, the liturgical scholar Robert Taft states, "This type of typikon (τυπικόν) is one of two Byzantine liturgical books with rules governing the celebration of services: where the diataxis gives the rubrics regulating the ordinary structure of services, the typikon indicates what is proper to each day of the year. There are three types of litur-

such as *Vatican 1609* and *1877*, *Vatopediou 1436*, and *Megistēs Lavras 99*, and the four manuscript Typika of the thirteenth century, as well as also the older *Sinai 1094*, attest to the same practice and similarly attribute it to the tradition of the monasteries of Palestine.

In any case, the tradition of not celebrating the complete Liturgy on these days appears to be common and most ancient. As it is well known, on the days during which a Liturgy is not performed, epistle and gospel readings are not provided for in the corresponding liturgical books, the Apostolos and the Gospel book. This precisely happens on the fasting days of Great Lent, except for Saturday and Sunday, and on both days of Cheesefare Week that are being discussed. Note that in some editions of the Apostolos, the reading of the Catholic Epistle of Jude ("Woe to the impious . . .")[76] is entitled as a reading "on the fourth day of the thirty-sixth week" instead of "on the fifth day of the thirty-sixth week." Wednesday and Friday of

gical typikon: the 'cathedral' Typikon of the Great Church for the rite of Hagia Sophia and other secular churches, and two 'monastic' forms, the Stoudite and Sabaitic Typika, which regulated services in monasteries," (Robert Taft, "Typikon," *ODB* 3:2131–2132). See also the brief discussion of the Typika by Phountoulēs at the beginning of questions 67 and 445. Saint Sabas (439–532), born in Cappadocia, travelled to Palestine and eventually established there the monastery of Mar Saba, the Great Lavra of Saint Sabas. On his life and monastic system, see Joseph Patrich, *Sabas, Leader of Palestinian Monasticism: A Comparative Study in Eastern Monasticism, Fourth to the Seventh Centuries*, Dumbarton Oaks Studies 32 (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1995) and Joseph Patrich, "Palestinian Desert Monasticism: The Monastic Systems of Chariton, Gerasimos, and Sabas," *Cristianesimo nella storia* 16 (1995): 1–9. The Typikon and monastic system under his name exercised a wide influence throughout the Byzantine and Slavic worlds and continues to exert a major role in the Orthodox Church. For a general assessment of the influence of Sabaite monasticism and specific studies covering a wide range of subjects, see Joseph Patrich, ed., *The Sabaite Heritage in the Orthodox Church from the Fifth Century to the Present*, Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 98 (Leuven: Uitgeverij Peters en Departement Oosterse Studies, 2001). The Typikon of Saint Sabas was published in various editions in 1545, 1577, 1603, 1615, 1643, 1685, 1691, 1738, 1771, and 2009. For a discussion of these editions as well as the text of the Typikon of Saint Sabas that will be referenced in the present work (outside of manuscript citations), see Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου, 2012).

76. Jude 11.

Cheesefare are lacking epistle and gospel readings because the celebration of the Divine Liturgy was not permitted on these days.

Now, why is a Liturgy not celebrated on these days? The service of these days gives us the answer. On them, a full service for fasting days is chanted, with Alleluia, triōdion, photagōgika, idiomela, a reading of the Trithektē,[77] and all the other features of the Lenten service. Namely, these are strict days of fasting, during which only one trapeza is provided after Vespers. This is prescribed by all the ancient Typika. However, nowadays there is a breaking of the fast on these two days. Nevertheless, the breaking is purely symbolic. During the fasting trapeza, the monks ate "a little cheese" or "a smallest amount of cheese" and this was, according to the ancient Typikon, "for averting any abominable heresy" or "because of any God-hating heresies," namely, of the Jacobites and the Tetradites according to canon thirty-three of Saint Nikēphoros of Constantinople.[78] Indeed, Blessed Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain[79] in the *Rudder*, when commenting on this canon and also citing other witnesses, does not consider the breaking of the fast and the eating of cheese permitted except outside of the monastery and in areas

77. Also known as the "τριτοέκτη." For studies of the Trithektē, see M. Arranz, "Les prières presbytérales de la Tritoekti de l'ancien Euchologe byzantin," *OCP* 43 (1977): 70–93, 335–354; Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Ἀκολουθίαι τοῦ Νυχθημέρου*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 1' (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 11–44.

78. The citation is corrected to canon thirty-three instead of thirty-two (Rhallēs and Potlēs, 4:430). The canon is incorrectly cited as thirty-two in the text. The canonist Theodōros Balsamōn (twelfth century) discusses this fasting practice. See the translation of his relevant writings in Patrick Viscuso, *Guide for a Church under Islam: The Sixty-Six Canonical Questions Attributed to Theodōros Balsamōn* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press), 121–123.

79. Saint Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain (Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης) (ca. 1748–1809), a hieromonk of the Mount Athos canonized by the Church of Greece in 1955, was one of the most prolific Orthodox theologians in the modern period. The range of his writings covers almost every aspect of theological study. His most important canonical work, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας (Rudder of the Noetic Ship of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of the Orthodox)*, more commonly referred to as *Πηδάλιον* or *Rudder*, was first published in 1800 and continues to be one of the main collections of canon law presently used in the Greek-speaking Orthodox churches.

where communities of the heretics in question exist.[80] His point of view is strict, but logically and historically correct. In some manner, Wednesday and Friday of Cheesefare Week are the propylaeum[81] of Great Lent.

According to the ancient taxis of the Church of Constantinople, and certainly of other churches outside of Palestine, before the Typikon of Saint Sabas was disseminated and became completely prevalent in them, the celebration of the Presanctified was prescribed on Wednesday and Friday of Cheesefare Week. This is clearly attested to by the Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople from the codices *Patmos 266* and *Timiou Staurou 40* from the tenth century,[82] by the Typikon of the Constantinopolitan Monastery of the Most Holy Theotokos Evergetis, which is preserved in codex 788 of the National Library of Athens from the twelfth century,[83] by canon thirty-three of Saint Nikēphoros,[84] and by Symeōn of Thessaloniki. According to the Typikon of Saint Sophia and Symeōn, the Patriarch himself celebrated the Presanctified of Wednesday. According to the Typikon of the Evergetis, during the Liturgy of Tuesday of Cheesefare Week the Presanctified Holy Bread was reserved for the Presanctified of Wednesday and during the Liturgy of Thursday the Presanctified for Friday.[85] According to both Typika, the Presanctifieds of both days had certain peculiarities in relation to the Presanctifieds of other days of Great Lent. Namely, they had only

80. Ἀγάπιος ἱερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 730–731.

81. Τὸ προπύλαιο (propylaeum, before the gate) is a structure forming the entrance to a temple, a porch.

82. Juan Mateos, ed. and trans., *Le Typicon de la Grande Église. Ms. Sainte-Croixe n°. 40, X^e siècle. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes,* OCA 165 and 166 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1962 –1963), 2:6–9.

83. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle,* Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 342–343, 346–347.

84. The citation is corrected to canon thirty-three instead of thirty-two (Rhallēs and Potlēs, 4:430).

85. Phountoulēs does not provide the textual reference.

one reading from the Old Testament, the first Presanctified from the Prophet Joel and the second from the Prophet Zacharias, the ones which also exist nowadays in the Triōdion, while the other Presanctifieds have two readings, as it is well known, one from Genesis and one from Proverbs. The "Light of Christ illumines all"[86] was not said; and, also on both days, instead of "Let my prayer arise . . .,"[87] the prokeimenon, "Let Israel hope in the Lord from henceforth and forevermore"[88] (Psalm 130:3), along with two verses from the same psalm, "O Lord, my heart was not exalted . . ."[89] and "If I was not humble-minded . . .,"[90] would be chanted in plagal of second tone. This prokeimenon—but with one verse—is also found nowadays at the end of the reading for the Vespers of Wednesday in the very same tone.

The Typikon of the Great Church in use nowadays provides for the celebration of the Liturgy of Chrysostomos if the leavetaking of the feast of the Meeting or the commemoration of a celebrated saint falls on Wednesday or Friday of Cheesefare Week. The *Calendar-Typikon of the Church of Greece*[91] for the year 1969 provides for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy of Chrysostomos on the Wednesday of Cheesefare (February 19) for the commemoration of Saint Philotheē of Athens, but only in temples that are celebrating her memory.[92] It is needless for us to write that this modern rubric does not agree with the ancient Typika, which permit the celebration of the Liturgy of Chrysostomos only if "the appointed day of the Meeting" would fall on one of these two days. Indeed, according to the Typikon of the Evergetis, even if the commemoration of a celebrated saint coincided, "even of the Forerunner himself or another

86. "Φῶς Χριστοῦ φαίνει πᾶσι."
87. "Κατευθυνθήτω . . ."
88. "Ἐλπισάτω Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος."
89. "Κύριε, οὐχ ὑψώθη . . ." (Ps 130:1).
90. "Εἰ μὴ ἐταπεινοφρόνουν . . ." (Psalm 130:2).
91. *Ἡμερολόγιον-Τυπικὸν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος).
92. For example, such celebrations would take place on account of the temple's dedication in her honor. However, the temple of Saint Andreas in Patisia (Athens) celebrates her memory as the site of her martyrdom (although the temple itself is dedicated to another saint).

of the great saints," the Alleluia was chanted and the Liturgy of the Presanctified was performed.[93] Moreover, the Triōdion only recognizes two cases for an exception, the feast "of the Meeting and of the Forerunner," namely, the commemoration of the First and Second Finding of His Head (February 24).

The opinion of Symeōn of Thessaloniki on the present case is outstanding for its historical accuracy. Symeōn, in replying to question fifty-six of Gabriēl of Pentapolis, "Why the Presanctified is not also celebrated on other fasting days," also refers to our topic when noting the following characteristics: "On the five days [of each week of Great Lent] the Presanctifieds are performed; and not on any other day has it been prescribed for the bloodless, life-sacrificing sacrifice[94] not to be celebrated, except on two other days, on Wednesday and Friday of the so-called Cheesefare, and on Great Friday. And the two days of Cheesefare are established as an introduction of the sacred fast days, since Cheesefare Week has also been prescribed as a preceding purification for us and as a preparation for the holy fast, so that having been first purified we may approach the fast and having abstained for a short time from foods with oil and meats, we may take part in the fast, pure ones in that most pure . . .[95] Wherefore, they have prescribed for there not to be an eating of meat during the week before the fast, but there to be an eating of cheese, and they call this the forefeast of the fast, and they appointed for them to chant the triōdia and idiomela, just as in holy Lent. They have placed in the middle these two days of fasting, Wednesday and Friday, on which they also prescribed that sayings of the prophets and the orations of Basileios the God-revealer concerning fasting are to be said. Wherefore, as the ancient Typikon of the Great Church also states, the Patriarch presiding celebrated the Presanctified on Wednesday of Cheesefare—on which and indeed on Friday after

93. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 332–333.

94. "ζωόθυτον θυσίαν." A similar expression ("ζωόθυτον θύμα") is also used in the ninth ode of the canon of Pascha.

95. PG 155:904d–905a. For a clarifying discussion, see the third paragraph of the present question.

fasting, it was also a custom for cheese to be eaten for the refutation of any heretical doctrine.[96] Therefore, on these two fasting days of Cheesefare, the Presanctified was thus celebrated from the beginning and this is found in the ancient Diataxeis, and the prophetic readings attest to this, as we have said, and no gospel readings are said on these days, just as they are not said on the five days of the week throughout Lent, as all the Gospel books show . . .[97] But I do not know how this—the Presanctified to be celebrated on those days—is now neglected. I think because the fast was incomplete and the complete Liturgy as a custom was not being performed, that also no attention was given to the Liturgy of the Presanctified. Besides, this is from the Jerusalemite Typikon, which is monastic.[98]"

Summarizing, then, the things above, we note that according to the practice of the entire Orthodox Church the celebration of the Divine Liturgy is forbidden on Wednesday and Friday of Cheesefare because these days liturgically belong to Great Lent. According to the ancient Typikon of the Church of Constantinople, the Liturgy of the Presanctified was performed. According to the Jerusalemite Typikon, not even that one. Namely, the practice of Jerusalem was stricter. From all this, it is concluded that in no instance is it permitted for the Divine Liturgy to be celebrated on these days. A case of absolute necessity for its celebration is inconceivable. Regarding the coincidence of certain feasts on these days, it would be preferable for them to be transferred to the nearest day (Tuesday, Thursday, or Saturday) or for the Presanctified to be celebrated according to the strictness[99] of the ancient Typika, or, finally, that the modern rubric of the Typikon of the Great Church is applied by oikonomia, and the Liturgy of Chrysostomos is celebrated, however, this only in completely extraordinary cases, namely, on feasts of very great saints

96. The fasting took place prior to the reception of the Presanctified gifts, and cheese would be consumed afterwards. For a discussion regarding this practice, see Patrick Viscuso, *Guide for a Church under Islām: The Sixty-Six Canonical Questions Attributed to Theodōros Balsamōn* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2014) 121–123.

97. PG 155:905c.

98. PG 155:908a.

99. ἀκρίβεια.

and especially only for temples that are celebrating.[100] In that case, the readings of the saint being celebrated would be read.

165

When must the priest who is about to officiate take kairos? At his entrance into the temple, during the kathismata as is customary, or at another point in the service of Matins?

The brief service of "kairos" is relatively late. The old manuscripts of the Divine Liturgy, aside from the fact that they do not contain standard rubrics, begin the Liturgy with the prayer of the prothesis, "O God our God, who did sent forth the heavenly bread . . .."[101] Initially, it appears that the priest took kairos in a very simple manner, namely, either seeking the blessing from the hierarch who was about to serve or preside, as also nowadays if a hierarch is present, or seeking forgiveness from the people, as more or less nowadays takes place during the Liturgy of the Presanctified. In any case, in the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of the patriarch of Constantinople, Philotheos (fourteenth century),[102] the "kairos" is established in "reverences" to

100. For example, those temples consecrated in honor of a great saint.

101. "Ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεός, ὁ τὸν οὐράνιον ἄρτον . . ."

102. Philotheos Kokkinos (Φιλόθεος Κόκκινος) was a patriarch of Constantinople (r. 1353–1354/1355, 1364–1376) and while abbot of the Great Lavra on Mount Athos authored the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* (*Διάταξις τῆς Θείας Λειτουργίας*) and the *Diataxis of Hierodeaconship* (*Διάταξις περὶ τῆς ἱεροδιακονίας*). Through the work's popularity and influence as a ceremonial, the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* canonized the Athonite rubrics for the Eucharist that came to govern the present celebration of the Byzantine Divine Liturgy. This discussion is based on Robert Taft, "Mount Athos: A Late Chapter in the History of the Byzantine Rite," *DOP* 42 (1988): 191–194. Phountoulēs used the *Diataxis* as one of the sources for a modern publication of a Hierodiakonikon, *Ἱεροδιακονικόν, περιέχον ἅπασαν τὴν διάταξιν τῆς Ἱεροδιακονίας εἰς τὸν ἑσπερινὸν καὶ τὸν ὄρθρον εἰς τὰς τρεῖς λειτουργίας* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος: Ἐκδ. Πανσέληνος, 1989). The text of the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* (*Codex Panteleēmonos 6277-770*) is published in Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας*, Texte und Forschungen zur Byzantinisch–Neugriechischen Philologie no. 15 (Ἀθῆναι: Ἡ ἐπιστημονικὴ ἐπιτροπὴ πρὸς ἀναθεώρησιν καὶ ἔκδοσιν τῶν λειτουργικῶν βιβλίων, 1935), 1–16. In addition, also while abbot, Philotheos authored the *Diataxis of Hierodeaconship* (*Διάταξις περὶ τῆς ἱεροδιακονίας*), which provides direction on how the deacon serves with a priest in Vespers, Matins, and Liturgy. The

the east and to the choirs, and in the prayer, "O Lord, stretch forth your hand . . .."[103] In another *Diataxis* nearly two centuries older, the prayer is not yet encountered, but the veneration of the sacred icons also taking place nowadays exists.[104] These are introductory points. As for the time at which the priest took and must take kairos, the following can be noted.

According to the ancient monastic taxis, which is observed even nowadays in the monasteries of the Holy Mountain and in the Slavic churches, the service of Matins is celebrated separately from the Divine Liturgy. Three intermediate services intervene between Matins and the Divine Liturgy: The First, Third, and Sixth Hours. The First Hour is attached to the Matins, and a complete dismissal takes place, and the service is taken up again after a break, the duration of which varies according to the feasts and the periods of the year. The second group of services includes the Third and Sixth Hours and the Divine Liturgy. Certainly, the Liturgy, as we have written elsewhere, is celebrated only on Sundays and feasts in the central temple of the monastery, the katholikon, but on the other days it is performed in side-chapels. The priest takes kairos before the enarxis of the Third Hour, enters the bēma, does the enarxis of the Third Hour, puts on his vestments and performs the proskomidē, censes after its conclusion, does the dismissal of the Hours, and begins the Divine Liturgy. Almost the same takes place in parish temples during the celebration of the Liturgy of the Presanctified.

The taxis in question that was observed in parish temples during the Byzantine era was different. After the service of Matins, the Hours were not read, but an interruption in the service occurred during which the people either left or remained in the temple and

---

text of the *Diataxis* may be found in PG 154:745–766. When referring to the "*Diataxis* of Philotheos," unless otherwise noted, Phountoulēs is referring to the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy.*

103. "Κύριε, ἐξαπόστειλον τὴν χεῖρά σου . . .," Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 1.

104. The manuscript is *Codex National Library of Athens 8 (under number 662)* from the twelfth–thirteenth centuries. For this text, see Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 1.

heard the "prereading,"[105] namely, a reading from biblical texts, usually from the Old Testament or the Acts of the Apostles, or lives of the saints of the day, patristic homilies, or even decisions of the Ecumenical Councils. Then it appears that the priests took kairos, put on their vestments, performed the proskomidē, and, when the appointed hour arrived, began the Divine Liturgy. At other times, it appears that the "prereading" itself did not occur, but the preparation of the priests took place in silence. Symeōn of Thessaloniki appointed that the polyeleos be chanted in Saint Sophia of Thessaloniki and in the other temples of his diocesan jurisdiction during the preparation and the vesting of the celebrants in order to cover this liturgically dead time with beautiful chanting. When they celebrated the Liturgy consecutively after Matins, they took kairos around the end of it and specifically, apparently, at the time when the hierarch takes kairos even nowadays when he is about to serve, namely, during the chanting of lauds. It should be noted that then, even in the parish temples, all the verses of the psalms of lauds were chanted and after the doxology the ektenēs and the plērōtika were said, namely, the priest had sufficient time available to comfortably perform the proskomidē without constraint, which, moreover, was older and simpler than the present one.

The *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* by Philotheos in all likelihood presupposes the separation of the Liturgy from Matins, just as we saw above in the Byzantine parish practice and is not concerned at all with the connection of the priest's preparation and the performance of the prothesis with Matins.

According to the modern rubrics which are contained in the printed Hieratika and Euchologia, the priests take kairos after the sixth ode of the canons. However, this presupposes that the entirety of the canons and the psalms of the lauds will be chanted because otherwise the time is insufficient for the "kairos," vesting, and proskomidē. This is also the reason for which nowadays the priest takes kairos much earlier, namely, before the enarxis of the service of Matins, during the kathismata, or even at some other op-

105. "προανάγνωσις."

portune time. The first would not be recommended, because, apart from the fact that it would be very early for the priest to be vested, before even the enarxis of the service, this brief service of the "kairos" itself presupposes the presence also of the people, from whom the priest would seek "forgiveness." But also, the entire prayer of the priest before the Divine Liturgy, the kissing of the icons, and so forth, is a beautiful element, which evokes profound compunction in those who come early to the temples, is attended with great piety by them, and engenders many sacred sentiments. Perhaps the most fitting time would be the chanting of the first and third odes of the canons, which usually are the only ones chanted in our temples. That is the only time that the priest has at his convenience to take "kairos" without being interrupted by the synaptes which are inserted between the kathismata.

166

In which instances during Vespers, is the theotokion of the resurrectional apolytikion chanted and in which instances not?

The relevant paragraph, "concerning apolytikia," of the Typikon of the Great Church (§15)[106] deals with the chanting of the resurrectional theotokion of the Octoēchos. The rubric refers chiefly to the resurrectional apolytikia, but indirectly also discusses the theotokia. From there and from prevailing practice, we can conclude the following:

1. The resurrectional theotokion is not chanted during great feasts of the Lord or of the Mother of God, whether these occur on Sunday or not.
2. It is also not chanted during the metheorta of the great feasts of the Lord or of the Mother of God, when in place of the theotokion, the apolytikion of the feast is chanted.
3. On Sundays, the resurrectional theotokion/apolytikion of the tone of the Sunday is chanted, or if the saint of the day has a doxastikon and its apolytikion is chanted, then the resur-

106. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 12–13.

rectional theotokion/apolytikion that matches the tone for saint's apolytikion is chanted.

4. When the saint of the day has a complete celebratory service (anabathmoi, and so forth, in the Matins) in the Mēnaia or in a special service book,[107] if the saint is celebrated locally, the resurrectional theotokion/apolytikion that matches the tone for the saint's apolytikion is chanted, as above.
5. When the saint does not have a complete celebratory service, after the saint's apolytikion, the theotokion is chanted that matches the tone of the saint's apolytikion and is taken from the theotokia of the day that are found at the end of the Paraklētikē and the Hōrologion ("Theotokia for each tone").[108]
6. The resurrectional theotokion must also be chanted on the leavetaking of each tone during the Vespers of Saturday (Friday evening) and in the Matins of Saturday, but in the tone of the apolytikion of the saint, whether the saint is being celebrated or not, namely, again according to the table of the theotokia of the eight tones in the Paraklētikē and in the Hōrologion. An exception appears only in the plagal of the second tone, where, instead of the resurrectional theotokion, "You who did call your mother blessed . . .,"[109] the chanting of the theotokion, "Gideon foreshadows your conception . . .,"[110] is provided for in the above instance.

167

Is it permitted during celebration of the Small Hagiasmos to omit the long prayer, "O Lord our God, who is mighty in counsel . . .,"[111] in the interest of time, according to the rubric given in the Apostolikē Diakonia's edition of the Small Euchologion?

---

107. "Ἰδιαιτέρα φυλλάδα."
108. "Θεοτοκία εἰς ἕκαστον ἦχον."
109. "Ὁ τὴν εὐλογημένην καλέσας σου Μητέρα . . ."
110. "Προϊστορεῖ ὁ Γεδεὼν τὴν σύλληψιν . . ."
111. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ μέγας τῇ βουλῇ . . ."

In the occasional services that are connected with the service of the Small Hagiasmos, the Apostolikē Diakonia's edition of the Small Euchologion appears at first glance to omit the long prayer in question. In this edition, these special occasional services are indeed introduced, in which, firstly, the shortening of the service of the Small Hagiasmos is intended by the omission of certain troparia and other elements, and secondly, the service's adaptation to the special needs, to which its celebration has in view, is intended by the addition of special readings, special petitions to the litany of peace, and the special prayer that concludes the service.[112] The prayer, "O Lord our God, who is mighty in counsel . . .," is not written out, not because it should be omitted, but because it is found included at the beginning of the Euchologion in the service of the Small Hagiasmos, which, according to the correct tradition of the manuscripts and the old printed editions of the "Hagiasmatarion," is placed as the first in the series of services of this small liturgical book, which,

112. In the first edition of the Small Euchologion (1956), which went through several printings by the time of Phountoulēs's writing, the services in question were introduced under the title, "Ἀκολουθίαι Περιστατικαί" (Occasional Services) and by a brief rubric, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἀποστολικὴ Διακονία, 1956), 313:

Ἐν ἁπάσαις ταῖς ἱεραῖς Ἀκολουθίαις ταύταις, ἐν αἷς τελεῖται Ἁγιασμός, εὐτρεπίζεται μικρὰ τράπεζα καὶ τίθεται ἐπ' αὐτῆς τὸ ἱερὸν Εὐαγγέλιον, ξύλινος ἀργυρόδετος, Σταυρός, θυμιατήριον (κατζίον), δοχεῖον μεθ' ὕδατος καθαροῦ, δύο κηροπήγια, ἐν οἷς ἀνάπτονται κηρία καθαρά, μικρὰ δέσμη βασιλικοῦ ξηροῦ καὶ λευκὸν καθαρὸν μάκτρον. Συνηγμένων δὲ πάντων τοῦ τε Λαοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ Κλήρου ἄρχεται ἡ Ἀκολουθία προεξάρχοντος τοῦ πρώτου Ἱερέως, ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἱεροπραξίᾳ, φέροντος ἐπιτραχήλιον, τοῦ δὲ διακόνου στιχάριον σὺν ὀραρίῳ.	In all these sacred Services, in which Hagiasmos is celebrated, a small table is prepared and placed on it are the sacred Gospel book, a wooden silver-bound Cross, a censer (katzion), a vessel with pure water, two candlesticks, in which pure candles are lit, a small bunch of dry basil, and a clean white towel. When all the People and the sacred Clergy have gathered, the Service begins with the Priest first in rank leading, as also in every sacred service, wearing an epitrachēlion, and the deacon a sticharion with an orarion.

These services that follow did not include the prayer, "O Lord our God, who is mighty in counsel . . ." and left the impression that the latter was not required.

moreover, for this reason bears the title, "Hagiasmatarion." I suppose that many clergy have succumbed to a misunderstanding of the somewhat unclear rubric of this Small Euchologion and perhaps also celebrated the service of the Small Hagiasmos without this prayer. Not only does it not prescribe the omission of this prayer, but it is impossible for this official publication of the Hagiasmatarion to even imply this, not simply because it would be an innovation, (perhaps this would be the least problem), but because this prayer is "the prayer of sanctification," according to the manuscripts, the prayer of consecration, without which the Hagiasmos does not take place. Namely, it would be a service of Hagiasmos,[113] without any sanctification of water.

And here is the matter in more detail: Every sacred ceremony is composed of a central immutable portion, which constitutes the nucleus of the service, and of peripheral, variable elements of a secondary importance. In the service of the Small Hagiasmos, the latter are the two psalms, the troparia, the readings, the litany of peace, the prayer of inclination, the troparia that follow, and the special prayers for each instance, which are added at the end of the service. These elements present a very great variety in the manuscripts, and most of them have been added into the service more recently. All these do not have a sanctifying character. Moreover, the litany of peace, as is well known, consists of diaconal exhortations to the people that encourage them to pray for the well-known common requests and especially for the sanctification of the water, which has been set forth ("That this water may be sanctified . . .,"[114] "That there may descend . . .,"[115] and so forth). The people responding to the invitation pray, when answering with "Lord, have mercy." Namely, in other words, they introduce the special prayer of the priest, which is about to follow. The small prayer of inclination, "Incline your ear, O Lord, and hearken to us . . .,"[116] which comes from the service of

113. The word "ἁγιασμός," transliterated here as Hagiasmos for the title of the service, literally means "sanctification" or "consecration."

114. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγιασθῆναι . . ."

115. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ καταφοιτῆσαι . . ."

116. "Κλῖνον, Κύριε, τὸ οὖς σου, καὶ ἐπάκουσον ἡμῶν . . ."

the Great Hagiasmos, does not entreat for the consecration of the water, which already is presupposed as having been accomplished, but for the sanctification of the people "through partaking of this water."[117] The plunging of the precious cross is not intended for the sanctification of the water, since in the prayer of inclination it is represented as having already been sanctified. Certainly, it is not encountered in the ancient manuscripts, but entered into the service of the Small Hagiasmos under the influence of the corresponding practice in the service of the Great Hagiasmos, where it was again later introduced in remembrance and reenactment of the Baptism of the Lord. Moreover, the sanctification of water does not take place in the parallel service of holy baptism through any immersion of the precious cross. In all three parallel services of holy baptism, the Great Hagiasmos, and the Small Hagiasmos, the sanctification only takes place through the sanctifying prayer. The troparia, the ektenēs, and the dismissal prayer that follow are the conclusion to the service. Moreover, the special prayers that are inserted towards the end, for a foundation of any building, for a new home, for fields, for a vineyard, and so forth, as well as the modern occasional prayers that the Hagiasmatrion of Apostolikē Diakonia introduces, are not prayers for sanctification of water, but prayers that aim at the blessing especially of works of human hands, for which the service of Hagiasmos was also celebrated.

There does not exist then any doubt that the sanctifying prayer must be sought in the interval between the litany of peace, through which the blessing is introduced, and the prayer of inclination, according to which the water is already sanctified. In the printed editions, we have the prayer, "O Lord our God, who is mighty in counsel . . .."[118] The manuscripts present some variety, but all agree that at this point there absolutely exists a prayer of sanctification, whether it is the one above or another one similar, "O great and most high God . . .,"[119] or another shorter one, "O God [or, Lord], our

117. "διὰ τῆς τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου μεταλήψεως."
118. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ μέγας τῇ βουλῇ . . ."
119. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ μέγας καὶ ὕψιστος . . ."

God, who changed in the presence of Moses the bitter water . . .."[120] This prayer should be equivalent to the prayer of the anaphora in the Divine Liturgy, or the prayers, "Great are you, O Lord . . ."[121] in the services of holy baptism and the Great Hagiasmos—influences of which we can easily detect in the texts of all the above prayers. The key point in this prayer is the invocation for the sanctification of the water, which is exactly like the invocation in the prayer of the anaphora of our Liturgies ("send down . . . and make . . ."[122]), or the corresponding point of the prayer of holy baptism and the Great Hagiasmos ("Do you yourself, therefore, O King, Lover of humankind, be present even now through the visitation of your Holy Spirit and sanctify this water . . .,"[123] "Do you yourself now, O Master, sanctify this water by your Holy Spirit . . ."[124]). This invocation in the current prayer, "O Lord our God, who is mighty in counsel . . .," is somewhat vague: "Do you yourself, O King, Lover of humankind, send down your blessing on us through the partaking and sprinkling of this water . . .."[125] In the other prayer, "O great and most high God . . .,"[126] it is clearer: "and send down on us your blessing and the grace of healings upon this water . . .."[127] Similarly, also in the prayer, "O Lord our God, who changed in the presence of Moses the bitter water . . .,"[128] it is also clearer: "do you yourself now, O Master, sanctify this water and make . . .."[129] According to many manuscripts, these phrases were repeated three times, consistent with the form of the prayer of holy baptism and of the Great Hagiasmos.

120. "Ὁ Θεὸς [ἢ Κύριε], ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τὸ πικρὸν ὕδωρ . . ."

121. "Μέγας εἶ Κύριε . . ."

122. "κατάπεμψον . . . καὶ ποίησον . . ."

123. "Αὐτὸς οὖν, φιλάνθρωπε Βασιλεῦ, πάρεσο καὶ νῦν διὰ τῆς ἐπιφοιτήσεως τοῦ Ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος καὶ ἁγίασον τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο . . ."

124. "Αὐτός, καὶ νῦν, δέσποτα, ἁγίασον τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ . . ."

125. "Αὐτός, φιλάνθρωπε βασιλεῦ, καὶ διὰ τῆς τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου μεταλήψεως τε καὶ ῥαντισμοῦ τὴν σὴν εὐλογίαν ἡμῖν κατάπεμψον . . ."

126. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ μέγας καὶ ὕψιστος . . ."

127. "καὶ κατάπεμψον ἡμῖν τὴν σὴν εὐλογίαν καὶ τῶν ἰαμάτων τὴν χάριν ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο . . ."

128. "Ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τὸ πικρὸν ὕδωρ . . ."

129. "αὐτός, καὶ νῦν, δέσποτα, ἁγίασον τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο καὶ ποίησον . . ." The words "it is clearer" are implied by the structure of the sentence.

I think that matters are so clear that they require nothing more to be added. Just as a Liturgy is not understood without the prayer of the anaphora, or the blessing of the water of holy baptism and Great Hagiasmos without the prayers of sanctification of water, thus also a Small Hagiasmos is not understood without its sanctifying prayer. For this reason and for removal of every misunderstanding, the pertinent explanation would be indispensable in a modern printed edition of the Hagiasmatarion. Again, if the usual prayer or another similar one is very lengthy and has many petitions irrelevant to the circumstances to which the special occasional services apply, I think that the brief and beautiful prayer could be introduced, which one encounters in many manuscripts and which is published by P. Trempelas in the *Small Euchologion*, volume 2, Athens 1955, p. 70.[130] In addition, Theophilos of Kampania published the prayer in another variant in his *Treasury of Orthodoxy*, seventh edition, Thessaloniki, p. 149.[131] Theophilos receives it from the Typikon of Symeōn of Thessaloniki ("*Diataxis . . .*" *Codex National Library of Athens 2047*), according to which its reading is provided for during the Hagiasmos that took place during the procession at the beginning of the Indic-

130. Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 2 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1950–1955), 2:70.

131. Θεόφιλος, Ἐπίσκοπος Καμπανίας, *Ταμεῖον Ὀρθοδοξίας περιέχον συνοπτικῶς καὶ διαλαμβάνον περὶ Θεοῦ, περὶ Πίστεως, περὶ ἐξηγήσεως καὶ χρήσεως τῶν ἑπτὰ Μυστηρίων, δέκα Ἐντολῶν, καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαιοτέρων τῆς Ἱερᾶς Ἐκκλησίας ἐθίμων*, 7th ed. (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, n.d.), 149. Theophilos (ca. 1715–d. after 1793), born in Ioannina, was bishop of Kampania (1749–1795), teacher, and scholar. He was best known for the *Ταμεῖον Ὀρθοδοξίας*, which was first published in 1780 in Venice and subsequently republished as a popular work in successive editions. This work is a series of theological questions and responses composed in 110 short chapters and written in vernacular Greek. Saint Athanasios Parios (Ἀθανάσιος ὁ Πάριος) (1722–1813) wrote the introduction. In addition, Theophilos authored a legal writing entitled, *Νομικόν*, which is divided into two parts that cover ecclesiastical and civil law, as well as a number of lesser works. In his writings, Theophilos was highly influenced by Eugenios Voulgarēs (Εὐγένιος ὁ Βούλγαρης) (1716–1806), one of the most important theologians and churchmen of this period. This discussion is based on Gerhard Podskalsky, *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft, 1453–1821* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1988), 354–356, and Νικηφόρος Λ. Φορόπουλος, "Θεόφιλος. Ἐπίσκοπος Καμπανίας," in *ΘΗΕ* 6:405-407.

tion (September 1). The precise text of the prayer according to the above codex is the following:

Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τὸ πικρὸν ὕδωρ ἐπὶ Μωυσέως τῷ λαῷ εἰς γλυκύτητα μεταποιήσας καὶ τὰ βλαβερὰ ὕδατα ἐπὶ Ἐλισσαίου ἅλατι θεραπεύσας καὶ τὰ Ἰορδάνεια ρεῖθρα ἁγιάσας τῇ ἀχράντῳ σου ἐπιφανείᾳ, αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν, Δέσποτα, ἁγίασον τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ καὶ ἐπιφοιτήσει τοῦ ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος, τοῦ γενέσθαι αὐτὸ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀρυομένοις καὶ μεταλαμβάνουσιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ εὐλογίας πηγήν, ἰατρεῖον παθῶν, ἁγιασμὸν οἴκων, πάσης ἐπιβολῆς ὁρατῆς τε καὶ ἀοράτου ἀλεξιτήριον. Ἐλθέτω τὸ Πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ κατασκήνωσον ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τούτῳ καὶ τοὺς σπίλους τῶν προσερχομένων ἰασάμενος, εἰσάγαγε πάντας ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν οὐράνιόν σου βασιλείαν· σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ ἁγιασμὸς ἡμῶν καὶ σοὶ τὴν δόξαν ἀναπέμπομεν . . .

O Lord our God, who in the presence of Moses changed the bitter water into sweetness for the people and cured in the presence of Elissaios the harmful water by salt and sanctified the streams of the Jordan by your immaculate Epiphany, also now yourself, O Master, sanctify this water by the operation[132] and visitation of your Holy Spirit, that it becomes for all who draw from and partake of it a source of blessing, a healing from passions,[133] a sanctification of homes, a protection against every plot visible and invisible. Let your Holy Spirit come upon us and dwell in this water, healing the stains of those who approach. Lead us all into your heavenly kingdom, for you are our sanctification and to you do we offer up glory . . .

168

Is it correct for us to place a pearl from the Holy Bread of Great Thursday in the holy chalice along with communion wine and for us to commune infants and the sick only from the communion wine, since the pearl is dry, and a danger exists during its swallowing? For the same reason, also in the Divine Liturgy, should we perhaps commune infants only from the Precious Blood? Then would we say, "The servant of God . . . partakes of the Body and Blood . . ." or only " . . .partakes of the Blood . . ."?

132. Lampe, s.v. "ἐνέργεια, ἡ."

133. The word "παθῶν" can alternatively be translated as "calamities" (Lampe, s.v. "πάθος, τό").

Normally, holy communion is given to the faithful under both eucharistic species, the bread and the wine, namely, the Precious Body and Blood of the Lord. However, in the older practice of our Church, we have examples of distributing holy communion to the faithful by exception under only one species, specifically, of the precious Body. There are witnesses that the faithful or the monks communed privately from the Holy Bread alone that they preserved from their attendance at Sunday Divine Liturgy communion, or that the priests reserved the Holy Bread for the celebration of the Liturgy of the Presanctified without them dripping on it or dipping it in the Precious Blood. We do not have witnesses regarding distribution of the Precious Blood alone. However, specifically in the cases that the inquirer refers to, minute particles of the pearls can be used from the reserved consecrated elements of Great Thursday, which after they remain in wine for sufficient time can be offered both to the most gravely ill and to smaller children without danger existing during their swallowing. Matters are easier for the communion of infants during the Divine Liturgy because the Holy Bread can be nearly dissolved in the Precious Blood and in order that miniscule traces of pearls are suspended and from this offered to the baby. In this sense, holy communion under both species can be offered without a need existing for us to invoke the distribution by oikonomia of one species alone or for us to seek modification of the traditional liturgical expression that accompanies holy communion.

169

In the prayer of the blessing of the holy oil of baptism we read, "for deliverance from every evil to those who are anointed with it in faith or also partake of it." Why is the prayer in the plural ("for those who are anointed/χριομένοις . . .partake/μεταλαμβάνουσι") and why does it speak about partaking of the oil ("they partake of it/μεταλαμβάνουσιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ")?

As for the first point of the question, namely, why the prayer is framed in the plural number: The older manuscripts not only have this prayer in the plural, but also other prayers and diaconal petitions of the service of holy baptism framed in the plural. This is so because it is also well known from other sources that the catechumens approached *en masse* for baptism during the great feasts, especially on Pascha and Theophany. Nowadays, the prayers have been modified to a singular form, but this point of the prayer of oil has remained in its old form.

As to the second question: Both the water of holy baptism and the oil of exorcism were blessed chiefly for baptism and the anointing of the catechumens before baptism. However, formerly, these were also used by the faithful for other related uses. Namely, we have witnesses from the manuscripts that after the sanctification of the water the priest sprinkled the faithful in attendance or that the faithful took sanctified water into their homes and kept it for the sanctification of their houses or properties or in order to drink from it. We have many such witnesses from the ancient practice of the Eastern and Western Churches. Indeed, in some places they would draw sanctified water after the pouring of the oil of the catechumens into it. The sprinkling and drawing from the sanctified water of holy baptism were preserved in our Church in the service of the Great Hagiasmos, which, as we have written elsewhere, is the blessing of the water of baptism slightly modified. Remnants of this ancient practice regarding the service of holy baptism can be seen in various codices, in the diaconal petitions of which the petition is found, "That these [waters] may be for a purification of souls and bodies for

all who draw in faith and partake of them . . .."[134] Something analogous also took place regarding the oil of the catechumens, the oil of exorcism. From the allusion that the prayer has, it seems that this oil was also used by the faithful who anointed themselves or partook of it as "an averting of every diabolical activity" and "for deliverance from all evils." In the West, it was used for other ceremonial needs as well, such as for example for the anointing of priests being ordained, of holy tables being dedicated, and of the bells of temples being dedicated. Perhaps the drinking of oil ("and they partake/καὶ μεταλαμβάνουσιν") appears strange to us nowadays. However, it is well known that formerly the faithful would drink from sanctified oil for their sanctification. Moreover, this is also attested to by the prayer of the Artoklasia ("the wheat, the wine, and the oil . . . and sanctify the faithful who partake of them").[135]

170

Is it correct for the entrance of the Gospel book, namely, of God's Word, of Christ, to be called "small" and the entrance of the unconsecrated gifts to be called "great"? How can the divine and sacred Gospel book be regarded as lesser than simple bread and wine?

The adjectives, "small" (μικρά) and "great" (μεγάλη), which are used nowadays for the characterization of the two entrances of the Divine Liturgy, are of a later time. Up until the thirteenth century, the manuscripts use the terms, "entrance,"[136] "first entrance,"[137] "entrance of the patriarch"[138] or "of the hierarch,"[139] "entrance with the

134. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ γενέσθαι αὐτὰ πρὸς καθαρισμὸν ψυχῶν καὶ σωμάτων, πᾶσι τοῖς ἁρυομένοις πίστει, καὶ μεταλαμβάνουσιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ . . ."

135. "τὸν σῖτον, τὸν οἶνον καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον . . . καὶ τοὺς ἐξ αὐτῶν μεταλαμβάνοντας πιστοὺς ἁγίασον."

136. "εἴσοδος."

137. "πρώτη εἴσοδος."

138. "εἴσοδος τοῦ πατριάρχου."

139. "τοῦ ἀρχιερέως."

Gospel book,"[140] "to enter,"[141] "to make an entrance,"[142] and so forth, only when they want to signify the present "small" entrance. For the transfer of the gifts, the noun, "entrance," is not even used. But already the term, "first entrance" (which one encounters in Saint Maximos the Confessor, *Mystagogy* 8–9, and in a manuscript from the twelfth–thirteenth century) suggests that the transfer of the gifts, even if it was not so named, nevertheless, was itself also considered an "entrance" during that era.[143] For the first time, the same term is used with its present-day meaning in a *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* from the twelfth–thirteenth century.[144] In this *Diataxis*, the "first entrance" (πρώτη εἴσοδος) is juxtaposed with the "great entrance" (μεγάλη εἴσοδος). In the *Diataxis* of Philotheos, we find the terms in their present form and meaning for the first time. The entrance of the Gospel book is called "small entrance" (μικρὰ εἴσοδος) and, "great entrance" (μεγάλη εἴσοδος), the entrance of the precious gifts.[145] It is from the *Diataxis* of Philotheos that the terms were also introduced into our liturgical texts.

It is from the later introduction of these two terms that the reason can be explained why these two adjectives were used for distinguishing the one entrance from the other. As we said, the present-day "small entrance" was originally alone called an entrance because this was the only one. It was really an entrance, not simply as

140. "εἴσοδος μετὰ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου."

141. "εἰσοδεύειν."

142. "ποιεῖν εἴσοδον."

143. Saint Maximos the Confessor (ca. 580–662), a major Church Father whose work was highly influential in Byzantine theology. His work, *Περὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῆς μυσταγωγίας (Concerning Ecclesiastical Mystagogy)*, is a commentary on the Liturgy. For its text, Phountoulēs most likely used PG 91:657–718. The critical edition is found in Christian Boudignon, ed., *Maximi Confessoris Mystagogia una cum Latina interpretatione Anastasii Bibliothecarii*, CCSG 69 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011); and an English translation in Jonathan J. Armstrong, trans., *On the Ecclesiastical Mystagogy—A Theological Vision of the Liturgy* (Yonkers, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2019). Armstrong bases his translation on the critical edition, which is reproduced in his work, and provides an overview of the writing as well as a bibliography.

144. *Codex National Library of Athens 8 (under number 662)*, Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 6.

145. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 6, 9.

nowadays only an entrance of the celebrants into the sanctuary, but an entrance of clergy and people in a procession into the temple. Saint Maximos speaks characteristically regarding it: "the first entrance of the hierarch into the holy church during the sacred synaxis . . . The entrance of the people with the hierarch . . . into the church."[146] The emphasis did not fall on the Gospel book, for this reason he did not say "entrance of the Gospel book" (εἴσοδος τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου) but rather "with the Gospel book" (μετὰ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου). The Gospel book was carried only when a gospel reading was about to be read during the synaxis. Its transfer occurred for purely technical reasons, namely, since it was found in the skeuophylakion or diakonikon, which was in the courtyard outside of the main temple. There, the priests put on their vestments, took the Gospel book, if its reading was anticipated, and clergy and people entered the temple in a procession. The entrance prayer was read in front of the gate of the temple, and the gate, the "entrance of the holies" (εἴσοδος τῶν ἁγίων),[147] namely, the entrance of the temple, was blessed (this is the more likely meaning of the blessing, "Blessed is the entrance

146. PG 91:688c–688d; Armstrong, 73.

147. Here, Phountoulēs makes clear that the "gate," namely, "the entrance of the holies" (εἴσοδος τῶν ἁγίων) or temple (later, the bēma), was blessed. "Τῶν ἁγίων," can be the genitive plural for the nouns "οἱ ἅγιοι" or "αἱ ἅγιαι" (a masculine or feminine gender plural, which among other meanings can be translated as 'holy ones,' 'saints,' and so forth, referring to persons) or "τὰ ἅγια" (a neuter gender plural, which can be translated as 'holies,' 'holy elements,' and so forth, referring to objects). In question 600, Phountoulēs makes clear that he favors the second understanding. See also the discussion of "τὰ ἅγια" in question 229. As the scholar Juan Mateos also states, "Τῶν ἁγίων, in our opinion, must be interpreted as the genitive of τὰ ἅγια ('sancta,' 'holy place,' 'sanctuary,' 'temple,'), a frequent name in the Old Testament for the temple of Jerusalem. The translation 'entrance of your saints' instead of 'entrance into your sanctuary' does not seem to fit in the context. 'Your saints' would be an old name for the Christian people, and in no case would it be said of the clergy alone," Juan Mateos and Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *A History of the Liturgy St. John Chrysostom: Volume I The Liturgy of the Word* (Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 2016), 166. The latter is an English translation and updating of Juan Mateos, *La Célébration de la Parole dans la Liturgie Byzantine: Étude historique*, OCA 191 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1971), 81–82.

of your holies . . ."[148]). In an old prayer of the entrance, older than that of nowadays, which is preserved in the most ancient Byzantine Euchologion, the *Codex Barberini 336* from the eighth century, in the Liturgy of Chrysostomos, a clear allusion occurs during the entrance of clergy and people, namely of the entire church into the temple: "O Benefactor and Maker of all creation, receive the church present . . . ."[149] Almost the same prayer with the same allusion exists at the same place also in the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos. However, no allusion exists regarding the Gospel book, either in this prayer or in the present-day, "O Master, Lord our God, who established the orders and hosts of angels and archangels in the heavens . . . ."[150]

This second prayer presupposes a later development of the Liturgy. Namely, the people entered earlier into the church, as also nowadays, and the priest prepared the prothesis during the chanting of the first two antiphons of the Liturgy. This entrance took place by the priests all alone into the bēma with the Gospel book for the recitation of the readings to take place, namely, the teaching part of the Liturgy. This practice was preserved in the hierarchical Liturgy. The hierarch here enters the sanctuary for the first time to assume his place together with the clergy on the synthronon, from where they followed the readings and the sermon. The later prayer makes mention regarding the entrance alone of the clergy, not into the temple, but into the bēma. The blessing is no longer addressed towards the royal gate of the temple, but towards the beautiful gate of the sanctuary. Even in this later period, the term "entrance" strictly speaking refers only to this entrance into the sanctuary. It was still an entrance of the clergy "with the Gospel book" and not an entrance "of the Gospel book."

148. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ εἴσοδος τῶν ἁγίων σου . . . ."

149. "Εὐεργέτα καὶ τῆς κτίσεως πάσης δημιουργέ, πρόσδεξαι προσιοῦσαν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν . . ." For the text of the prayer, see Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336*, Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 24.2.

150. "Δέσποτα Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ καταστήσας ἐν οὐρανοῖς τάγματα καὶ στρατιὰς ἀγγέλων καὶ ἀρχαγγέλων . . ."

As we saw, the term, "entrance," was not originally used for the transfer of the gifts because this was not even about an entrance. The transfer took place in the simplest manner by the deacons alone, who choose from the many offerings the gifts suitable for the sacrifice and transferred them to the altar, where the bishop received them, as also nowadays. Later, namely, during the sixth century, the offering of the gifts began to occur with great splendor. The priests, the lower clergy, and the emperor with his retinue took part in it. Namely, it became a true procession. However, the hierarch still remained in his old position, in front of the altar, and there received the precious gifts, the offering of the Church. Besides, in hierarchical Liturgies, he is the chief celebrant. Then, a name was also sought for this procession, and it was called an "entrance" as also the first, but "great" by reason of its splendor in contrast to the "first," the "small" one, which had lost, indeed in comparison with the second, its original majesty along with its practical purpose. The priests were already found in the bēma even before this entrance, and the Gospel book was already located on the holy table also before the entrance. However, it remained as a ceremonial procession and since it was not a real entrance of the clergy into the bēma as before, the emphasis fell on the Gospel book. It became an "entrance" no longer "with" but "of the Gospel book," "small," because it did not have the splendor of the "great" one.

The symbolisms, which were given to the two entrances, came in a later era to confirm and to justify the simplicity of the first compared to the splendor of the second. Thus, the small entrance is presented as depicting "the manifestation at the Jordan" of the

Lord (Sōphronios,[151] Theodōros of Andida[152]) or the first coming of Christ in the world (Maximos) or the coming of the Lord, entrance into the world, and manifestation at the Jordan (Germanos[153]) or

151. The author is otherwise known as Pseudo-Sōphronios of Jerusalem. According to René Bornert, the liturgical commentary falsely attributed to Sōphronios (possibly Saint Sōphronios of Jerusalem, r. 633–638), most likely dates to the twelfth century, but not later than the thirteenth or earlier than the eleventh. Although variously titled, the manuscript contained in *Vaticanus Ottobonianus 459* was the basis for its publication in Migne and was entitled, *Λόγος περιέχων τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν ἅπασαν ἱστορίαν καὶ λεπτομερῆ ἀφήγησιν πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ ἱερουργίᾳ τελουμένων (Oration containing all ecclesiastical history and a detailed narration of all performed in the Divine Sacred-Service)*, PG 87:3981b–4001b. Phountoulēs most likely referenced this edition. For a discussion of the commentary, see René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 210–211.

152. Theodōros of Andida (twelfth century) is little known except for the work, *Προθεωρία κεφαλαιώδης περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ λειτουργίᾳ γινομένων συμβόλων καὶ μυστηρίων πονηθεῖσα ἐκ προτροπῆς καὶ ἀξιώσεως τοῦ Θεοφιλεστάτου ἐπισκόπου Φυτείας Βασιλείου (Summary Commentary concerning the symbols and mysteries occurring in the Divine Liturgy, composed at the behest and request of His Eminence Basileios, bishop of Phyteia)* (PG 140:417–468). According to René Bornert, the *Προθεωρία* is the earlier writing of Nikolaos of Andida, which was revised and abridged by Theodōros, who may have been a later successor to the same episcopal see. Bornert dates the original work of Nikolaos between 1055–1063. J. Darrouzès disagrees with Bornert and dates the work before 1100, most likely between 1085–1095. For this discussion, see René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 181–206, and J. Darrouzès, "Nicolas d'Andida et les azyme," *Revue des études byzantines* 32 (1974): 199–203. For a theological analysis of the work, see Hans-Joachim Schulz, *The Byzantine Liturgy* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1986), 89–99. Additional studies include Roland Betancourt, "A Byzantine Liturgical Commentary in Verse: Introduction and Translation," *OCP* 81 (2015): 433–472 and Barbara Crostini, "Interpreting the Interpreters: The Principles and Aims of the Protheoria," *Ostkirchliche Studien* 42 (1993): 51–59. The translation of the terms "Προθεωρία κεφαλαιώδης" as "Summary Commentary" is based on Betancourt's study, who has written overviews of Nikolaos and Theodōros of Andida for a forthcoming work, Michael Grünbart and Alexander Riehle, eds., *Lexikon byzantinischer Autoren* (Leipzig: Akademie Verlag). Cited 4 December 2019. Online at: https://www.academia.edu/1863449/Entries_for_Nikolaos_von_Andida_and_Theodoros_von_Andida_

153. Saint Germanos I, patriarch of Constantinople (r. 715–730), is attributed authorship of a commentary on the Liturgy entitled, *Ἱστορία Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ καὶ Μυστικὴ Θεωρία (Ecclesiastical History and Mystical*

"the manifestation of the Lord . . . when he began to be revealed" (Kabasilas[154]) or, finally, the Resurrection and Ascension (Symeōn). In contrast, according to the same Byzantine commentators of the Divine Liturgy, the great entrance is connected with more glorious and sacred events: the "course" of Christ's life in the world up until his burial (Sōphronios) or the triumphal entrance into Jerusalem (Sōphronios, Germanos, Theodōros of Andida, Kabasilas) or the carrying out of his body (Germanos) or, finally, his awe-inspiring and glorious second coming (Symeōn).

From what we wrote, I think it became clear that the terms "small" and "great," which nowadays characterize the entrances of the Divine Liturgy, are due not to the importance of what is carried in each of them (Gospel book—Christ, gifts—antitypes), but rather to the historical formation and development of the entrances themselves.

Contemplation), a work of synthesis, major influence, and importance. For a discussion of authorship and an important study, see René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 125–180. For its modern translation and an introduction, see Paul Meyendorff, trans., *St. Germanus of Constantinople, On the Divine Liturgy* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984). For a detailed examination of the work's significance, see Robert Taft, "The Liturgy of the Great Church: An Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of Iconoclasm," *DOP* 34–35 (1980–1981): 45–75.

154. Nikolaos Chamaetos Kabasilas (Νικόλαος Χαμαετὸς Καβάσιλας) (b. ca. 1320–1324, d. after 1391) lived in Thessaloniki as a theologian. His writings on the Liturgy continue to exercise a major influence on Orthodox liturgical thought. The Sources Chrétiennes edition will be used for a text of his liturgical commentary, *Ἑρμηνεία τῆς Θείας Λειτουργίας (Explanation of the Divine Liturgy)*. The paragraph numbers of Kabasilas's work will be given consistent with the Sources Chrétiennes edition, which differs from those cited by Phountoulēs. For an English translation, see J. M. Hussey and P. A. McNulty, trans., *Nicholas Cabasilas, A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy* (St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1977). For an assessment of his work, see Ἀθανάσιος Ἀ. Ἀγγελόπουλος, *Νικόλαος Χαμαετὸς Καβάσιλας, Ἡ ζωὴ καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελέτων, 1970) and René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 215–244.

See for more regarding this subject the study of Fr. Juan Mateos, "The small entrance of the Divine Liturgy," *Grēgorios Ho Palamas*, vol. 56 (1973), pp. 365–381.[155]

171

Is what is said by certain priests at the dismissal, "of our Father among the saints . . .whose Divine Mystagogy we celebrate"[156] valid dogmatically? Does the Mystagogy belong to Father A or B, or to Christ himself?

This phrase is nowadays said by some priests during the proskomidē at the time that the last of the nine particles of the saints is excised, and also during the dismissals of the proskomidē and of the Divine Liturgy. The older manuscripts do not describe the dismissal because it did not take place in the form that the present-day one is done and the later manuscripts that have it in its present-day form do not busy themselves on this point. Similarly, also, details concerning the particles are only found in later manuscripts because earlier the lamb alone was excised and offered without any particles. Moreover, the later manuscripts and the printed editions, which refer to the particle of the saint whose name the Divine Liturgy bears and to his commemoration in the dismissal, do not have the phrase, "whose Mystagogy . . .," but simply his name alone. In the proskomidē, in some later manuscripts, it is recorded with reference concerning the last particle, "Of our Father among the saints, [name], archbishop of [name of city], whose Liturgy is celebrated" (Τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Πατρὸς ἡμῶν [δεῖνος], ἀρχιεπισκόπου [πόλεως δεῖνος], οὗτινος ἡ λειτουργία ἐπιτελεῖται), but the clarification, "whose" (οὗτινος), does not refer to what the priest would say but indicates to him which saint he would commemorate at this point. Moreover, especially at the dismissal, both relative clauses that would be introduced so near to each other are also not easy on the ear, "of our Father among the saints . . . whose Mystagogy . . . of the saint . . . and whose memory . . .." From all this, it follows that the addition of the adjunct, "whose

155. Juan Mateos, "Ἡ μικρὰ εἴσοδος τῆς θείας λειτουργίας," *Γρήγοριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς* 56 (1973): 365–381.

156. "τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Πατρὸς ἡμῶν . . .οὗ τὴν θείαν μυσταγωγίαν ἐπιτελοῦμεν."

Mystagogy . . .," to the name of the saint whose name the Liturgy bears, which would be celebrated or was celebrated, neither is necessary nor attested to by the manuscript, printed, or even oral liturgical tradition. These are the points regarding the liturgical position of this addition.

I think that dogmatically this formula must not be considered as absolutely inaccurate. There exists no doubt that Christ is the great archpriest, "the one who offers and is offered, the one who receives and is distributed," according to the prayer, "No one is worthy . . .."[157] But just as the singular priesthood of the Lord does not take away the priesthood of the priests of His Church, but, on the contrary, by its power human beings become participants of His hierarchical dignity, by this same reason, I think, while the former is the celebrant and the initiator into the mysteries,[158] both the priests who celebrate the Liturgy and the authors of the texts of the Liturgies can themselves also be characterized with the same term. The word, "mystagogy" (μυσταγωγία), is here identical in meaning to the word, "liturgy" (λειτουργία), or of the liturgical text which contains the Liturgy that was composed by Basileios the Great or sacred Chrysostomos. In most cases, we use analogous terms and certainly the phrases, "Liturgy of Chrysostomos" and "Liturgy of Basileios the Great," without creating for us the suspicion that we are using them improperly. In the same manner, we also speak regarding the celebration of these Liturgies by our priests nowadays: "he performed the Liturgy," "he served," "he will officiate," and so forth. Would not Christ still be the celebrant?[159] Perhaps this manner of expression might still be considered common and not absolutely accurate. Nevertheless, in our liturgical texts themselves, similar expressions are encountered: "that I may celebrate the bloodless sacred-service,"[160] "to perform the ministry of your holy and immaculate Body,"[161] "en-

157. "Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος . . ."
158. ὁ μυσταγωγός.
159. ὁ λειτουργός.
160. From the service of preparation, "τὴν ἀναίμακτον ἱερουργίαν ἐπιτελέσω."
161. From the prayer of the cherubic hymn, "ἱερουργῆσαι τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ἄχραντόν σου σῶμα."

able us to offer,"[162] "this Liturgy which you have deigned to receive from our hands"[163] from the Liturgy of Chrysostomos; "to become celebrants of your holy altar . . . let us offer to you a sacrifice of praise,"[164] "to serve at your holy altar"[165] from the Liturgy of Basileios the Great, and many others. The controversial phrase must be placed in the same context and must also be interpreted in this sense. I do not think that it is dogmatically wrong.

172

What must be done when the celebrating priest falls gravely ill specifically after the consecration of the precious gifts and cannot complete the Divine Liturgy and there is no other priest in this area who has not yet served in order to complete it?

Regarding this topic, I will again also cite what is written in the "Teaching for priests and deacons,"[166] which is found at the end of the printed edition of the *Complete Works* of Symeōn of Thessaloniki in a modern Greek translation of the priest, Polyzōēs Lampanitziōtēs,[167]

---

162. From the prayer of the proskomidē after the plērōtika, "ἱκάνωσον ἡμᾶς προσενεγκεῖν."

163. From the anaphora, "τῆς λειτουργίας ταύτης, ἣν ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν δέξασθαι κατηξίωσας."

164. From the first prayer of the faithful, "γενέσθαι λειτουργοὺς τοῦ ἁγίου σου θυσιαστηρίου . . . προσάγωμέν σοι θυσίαν αἰνέσεως."

165. From the second prayer of the faithful, "λειτουργεῖν τῷ ἁγίῳ σου θυσιαστηρίῳ."

166. "Διδασκαλία πρὸς τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ διακόνους."

167. Polyzōēs Lampanitziōtēs or Lampanitsiōtēs (Πολυζώης Λαμπανιτζιώτης or Λαμπανιτσιώτης), born 1726 Ioannina–death 1799 Venice. Βασίλειος Τσακίρης attributes the authorship of the "Teaching" to Kallinikos III of Constantinople (1713–1791, r. 1757), see Βασίλειος Τσακίρης, "Προσθῆκες στὴν ἑλληνικὴ βιβλιογραφία, Νέα Στοιχεία γιὰ τὰ δύο ἔντυπα ἔργα τοῦ Πατριάρχη Καλλίνικου Γ'," *Ὁ Ἐρανιστής* 27 (2009): 253–258 (https://ejournals.epublishing.ekt.gr/index.php/eranistis/article/view/1460/1459, accessed September 17, 2021). For further information on the author, see Π. Παναγιωτίδης, "Πολυζώης ὁ Λαμπανιτσιώτης καὶ αἱ ἐκδόσεις αὐτοῦ," *Ἑλληνικὸς Φιλολογικὸς Σύλλογος Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* 27 (1900): 325–328, who favors the spelling of the name with a "σ" in place of the "ζ" based on its geographical origin; and Στέφανος Μπέττης, "Πολυζώης Λαμπανιτσιώτης, ὁ μεγαλύτερος ἕλληνας ἐκδότης τοῦ ΙΗ' αἰώνα," *Ἠπειρωτικὴ Ἑστία* 16 (1967): 499–523.

which was done during 1791 in Leipzig.[168] These instructions are, at least as far as I know, the only relevant ones that exist. They are also included by others later in various publications, such as by the sacred teacher (ἱεροδιδάσκαλος) Daniël Geōrgopoulos in his book, *Sacred Anthology*, which was published for the first time in Venice during 1833 and has known many reprintings.[169] The "Teaching" certainly does not have canonical authority, but has been scrutinized "meticulously"[170] by Patriarch Kallinikos III and "by the Synod for the Teacher."[171] The tenth chapter of the "Teaching," "Concerning what happens to the celebrant priest as a human being," also gives us instructions regarding our topic, which are based on ecclesiastical tradition, and the strictness and piety with which they have been written are characteristic.

"If the serving priest becomes so gravely ill before the consecration of the Lord's Body and Blood, that he is no longer able to perform his duty or dies, immediately, the Liturgy is abandoned and ceases.

---

168. Πολυζώης Λαμπανιτζιώτης, trans., *Τοῦ μακαρίου Συμεὼν Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης τὰ ἅπαντα εἰς τέσσερα μέρη διαιρεθέντα: ἐν οἷς περιέχονται διάλογοι ἐκκλησιαστικοί* (Leipzig: n.p., 1791).

169. Δανιὴλ Γεωργόπουλος, *Ἱερὰ Ἀνθολογία: περιέχουσα ἑρμηνείαν ἐπὶ τῆς τελετῆς τῶν ἑπτὰ μυστηρίων τῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας ἔτι δὲ διάφορα ἄλλα χρήσιμα καὶ ἀναγκαῖα πρὸς ὁδηγίαν τοῦ εὐαγοῦς Ἱερατείου* (Venice: Ἐκ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Τυπογραφίας Φραγκίσκου Ἀνδρεόλα, 1833; 5th ed., Ἀθῆναι: Ν. Μιχαλόπουλος, 1898), 93. Daniël Geōrgopoulos (Δανιὴλ Γεωργόπουλος) was born in Zygovisti, a village in western Arcadia, lived in the first half of nineteenth century, and was a scholar, teacher, and preacher. He actively participated in the Greek Revolution and was appointed "sacred preacher" (ἱεροκῆρυξ) by the Holy Synod of Greece. His best-known work cited above was published in 1833 at Venice and was entitled, *Sacred Anthology: containing an explanation on the celebration of the seven mysteries of the Orthodox Church as well as various useful and necessary information for guiding the holy clergy.* This discussion of his life and work is based on Φώτιος Χρυσανθόπουλος, *Βίοι Πελοποννησίων Ἀνδρῶν* (Ἀθῆναι: Π.Δ. Σακελλάριος, 1888), 314, and Πολύκαρπος (Συνοδινός), "Δανιὴλ Γεωργόπουλος," *Θεολογία* 8 (1930): 72–78.

170. "μετ' ἀκριβείας." This quoted phrase is taken directly from the title of the work.

171. This phrase means that the work is approved "for the Teacher," namely, for use in schools.

But if this happens after the consecration and its consummation, if another priest is there attending[172] the Liturgy, let him complete it, beginning from the part and the words where the first priest stopped.

But if the one who became ill did not die but lives and is able to receive the Holy Mysteries, let the one serving instead of him cut a small particle of the Holy Bread, take the Divine Blood with the labis, and administer communion to him; let him commune himself according to the taxis and complete the service as usual.

But if there is not another priest to complete the Liturgy and to consume the Holy Elements, let a man from those pious and pure who takes the covering, while not touching barehanded, cover the Holy Elements well so that nothing might enter the paten or the holy chalice until the time when another priest might arrive; let the one who comes complete the Divine Liturgy on another day (or on another table if this is during the same day); and after beginning with the proskomidē and also excising another new lamb let him consecrate as usual at the proper time; and after the consumption of the new pearl, let him also consume the old pearl and drink the Divine Blood, or after pouring it out into the holy chalice, let him consume everything together in the sanctuary.

But if this happened before the blessing of the divine gifts, let the other priest or similarly the one who served completely, after the transfer of the Divine Mysteries in the sanctuary and after their consumption, also consume the bread and wine left over, except not as the Body and Blood of Christ, but as blessed bread and wine."[173]

---

172. "ἀκούων." The implication is that the second priest is attending in the sense of "listening," not actively participating.

173. Πολυζώης Λαμπανιτζιώτης, trans., *Τοῦ μακαρίου Συμεὼν Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Θεσσαλονίκης τὰ ἅπαντα εἰς τέσσερα μέρη διαιρεθέντα: ἐν οἷς περιέχονται διάλογοι ἐκκλησιαστικοί* (Leipzig: n.p., 1791), 473–474. In his answer to question 461, Phountoulēs also points out that:

> In any case, the consumption of the remainders of the Holy Gifts was not only done by the priests or the deacons. There is ancient evidence preserved by the historian of the sixth century, Evagrius the Scholastic, which Nikēphoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos repeats during the fourteenth century, who reliably records the evidence from the former, as is shown from the textual similarities. This concerns the narrative of a miracle that took place during the reign of Patriarch Mēnas of Constantinople (536–552), during which

173

How are celebrated saints commemorated during dismissals and in the other instances?

174

During the dismissals for the feasts of the Precious Cross, feasts of the Mother of God, and the various synaxes and the recovery of relics, is it correct for us to commemorate during the dismissal the Cross, the Mother of God, or the saint with the specification, "whose finding . . ."[174] or "the recovery of whose relics . . .,"[175] and so forth?[176]

At various points of our Church's services, such as the prayer, "O God, save your people . . .,"[177] of Matins, at the prayer, "O most merciful Master . . .,"[178] of the Litē and Artoklasia, at the prosko-

---

a child of a Jewish family, who communed by mistake—during the consumption of the Holy Elements—of the undefiled Mysteries, was preserved safe from the fires, into which his enraged father threw him for punishment. According to this narrative, it was an old custom in Constantinople for priests to invite small children to consume the remains of the Precious Gifts: 'Ancient custom in the imperial city has it that when a substantial quantity of the holy portions of the immaculate Body of Christ our God remain left over, chaste boys (παῖδας ἀφθόρους) sent for are from among those studying with an elementary school master and they consume these holy portions' (Ecclesiatical History 4.36). [Translation of Evagrius adapted from Michael Whitby, trans., *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), 241].

In question 172, Phountoulēs is explaining why a priest or deacon who did not serve could consume the gifts but does not draw an implication regarding the emergency or exceptional consumption by a member of the people. In the tradition mentioned above, clergy are administering the Holy Elements to be consumed by children. The case in question 172 is one where no clergy are available for the consumption, but clergy who have already celebrated might be able to administer the gifts for their consumption by chaste boys or one of the people considered pure.

174. "οὗ τὴν εὕρεσιν."

175. "οὗ τὴν ἀνακομιδὴν τῶν λειψάνων."

176. See also questions 131, 154, 279, 295, 341, 342, 343, 369, 404, 421, 560, and 595.

177. "Σῶσον Κύριε τὸν λαὸν σου . . ."

178. "Δέσποτα πολυέλεε . . ."

midē, and especially at dismissals, apart from the list of names of the saints mentioned according to tradition, the saint of the day is referenced, "and whose memory we celebrate."[179] The "technique" of this insertion, so to speak, calls for a certain knowledge, experience, and attention. In the answer to question two, we have written in detail about the epithets that accompany the names of saints. We return in more detail to another point of the topic, to which the above two questions are referring. Regarding this topic, we had dedicated only a few lines in the former answer. The old practice is not precisely known, because the manuscripts on this point are quite laconic. We will base ourselves chiefly on contemporary practice, as presented in printed liturgical books and the oral tradition in the present case.

In ordinary cases of saints celebrated daily, where their names are not referenced in the customary catalogue of saints' names that are commemorated in the instances above, the matter is very simple. The name of the saint is placed in the genitive and "and whose memory we celebrate" follows. Specifically, only the saint having a doxastikon in the service of Vespers is commemorated (G. Violakēs, *Typikon of the Great Church of Christ*, M. Saliveros, in Athens 1921, § 16 "Concerning the dismissal in general," p. 14).[180] However, this is not observed in practice, and in my opinion correctly. Provided there exists a service in the Mēnaia for a saint and this saint is honored on this day, whether it has a full service or not, this is the saint whose memory we celebrate, even if not in a festive manner. Moreover, during the era when this rubric of the Typikon took shape, a distinction was applied more austerely between celebrated and uncelebrated saints. Not even the apolytikion of the latter was chanted during the service, but instead the apolytikion of the day was said in the places of the service where its chanting was provided for (Monday for the Bodiless, Tuesday for the Forerunner, and so forth), and in the Matins the "Alleluia" was chanted even outside of Great Lent. Nowadays, the Heortologion has expanded, and all the saints are celebrated. However, in the commemoration of their

179. "οὗ καὶ τὴν μνήμην ἐπιτελοῦμεν."

180. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 14.

names, there must be a limit so that we do not arrive at the other extreme. Namely, every day in the Mēnologion, a whole list of saints is commemorated, whose memory is celebrated, "on this day." The commemoration must be limited to the main ones and indeed to those who have a service in the Mēnaion or to local saints who do not have a service in the Mēnaion, but for whom we wish to highlight their memory (for example, for the new martyrs, and so forth). The table that is found in the appendix of the Hieratikon of the publications of the Apostolikē Diakonia, correctly I think, follows this principle, which is entitled, "Mēnologion of the entire year in order that the priest is guided for the name of which saint that must be commemorated in the sacred prothesis and the dismissals" (1962 edition, pp. 315ff.). Many saints that do not have a doxastikon are recorded in it.

The first difficulty is presented in the instance where the name of the saint exists in the catalogue of names which, from oral tradition or since it exists in our liturgical texts, the priest recites on every occasion. Saying the name of a saint twice, one time in its proper order and another at the end as the saint of the day, is not logically correct. Our most proficient liturgists omit in that case the name at the beginning and commemorate it only at the end. For example, if it is the memory of the Prōtomartyr Stephanos, in the Matins, where his name is in "Save, O God, your people . . .,"[181] it would only be said at the end together with "and whose memory we celebrate"; if it is the commemoration of the sacred Chrysostomos, only the other two of the Three Hierarchs would be commemorated at the usual place and Chrysostomos as the saint being celebrated at the end, and so forth. The same also takes place in the service of the prothesis during the excision of the particles. It is certainly self-evident that the Indiction, commemorations of earthquakes, dedications of temples, and so forth, would not be commemorated, inasmuch as they are not persons for the sacrifice to be offered in their honor or for us to invoke their intercessions.

181. "Σῶσον ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαόν σου . . ."

Matters are more complicated with the commemoration of miracles, recovery of relics, and the synaxes of saints. For example, the synaxis of the Seventy Apostles is on January 4, the recovery of the relics of Iōannēs Chrysostomos on January 27, Saint Athanasios the Great on May 2, Saint Theodōros the General on June 8, the Holy Unmercenaries Kyros and Iōannēs on June 28, Saint Stephanos on August 2, and others. Moreover, there are cases where we celebrate saints not on the day of their "memory"—namely, of their death, which happened on this day, or if it was not precisely known, was placed on this day by agreement, as for example in the commemorations of prophets, apostles, and so forth—but which essentially are synaxes in their honor, as for example, for the Patriarchs of Alexandria Athanasios and Kyrillos (January 18), the Three Hierarchs (January 30), Symeōn the God-receiver and Anna (February 3), and so forth. It would be absurd and incorrect in all the instances above, for their synaxes and recoveries of relics to be commemorated according to the well-known form from the previous case, "the synaxis . . . of which the memory . . ." or "the recovery . . . of which the memory . . .." Moreover, the commemoration of these saints in the usual manner—as if it was the case of their remembrance with their name in the genitive and with the adjunct, "whose memory we celebrate"—would simplify matters but would not be correct liturgically. The omission of the commemoration of these events would still simplify matters more, namely, if the commemoration of the saint (to whom the synaxis or recovery of relics is associated) was completely ignored. However, I think that this would be incorrect since the entire service of the day refers to these events and sometimes indeed a festive celebration of the saints also takes place on these days. Thus, I think the priests act correctly when at the end of the dismissal they place the name of the saint or of these saints with the adjunct, "whose synaxis we celebrate"[182] or "the recovery of whose holy relics we celebrate."[183]

The category of great saints, such as the Theotokos, the Forerunner, the Archangels, and the Apostles, who are commemorated

182. "οὗ τὴν σύναξιν ἑορτάζομεν."
183. "οὗ τὴν ἀνακομιδὴν τῶν ἁγίων λειψάνων ἑορτάζομεν."

in the first part of the dismissals and other prayers, constitutes a special case. For the same reasons that I referred to above, I think that priests act correctly when after the exclamation of the name of these saints in the corresponding instances they add, "whose Entrance we celebrate"[184] (November 21), "whose Conception we celebrate"[185] (September 23), "whose synaxis we celebrate,"[186] (January 7), "whose synaxis we celebrate"[187] (November 8, June 30), and others. At the Dormition of the Theotokos, the Beheading of the Forerunner, the Translation of John the Theologian,[188] the phrase could be employed, "whose [ἧς or οὗ] memory we celebrate,"[189] inasmuch as this concerns the death of these sacred persons and the term, "memory" (μνήμη), in these cases, can have application in its literal sense.

I do not know what would prevent the application of the same principle also to feasts of the precious Cross, namely, if the priest added to, "the precious and life-creating Cross,"[190] on the corresponding feast, "whose Exaltation [Finding, or Procession, and so forth] we celebrate."[191]

Regarding the feasts of the Lord, the observations above do not apply. Here, the mention of the feast takes place with the special characteristic of the dismissal ("May He who rose from the dead,"[192] and so forth).

Also, again regarding any objection that the practice considered as accurate would not be consistent with this form of the dismissals or other relevant prayers, allow me to reiterate the fact that it would be in vain to seek in the manuscript tradition a basis for either one or the other position. Inasmuch as the present practice gives the possibility for us to choose between the two, I do not see the reason for which we ought not choose the one most correct logically and litur-

184. "ἧς τὰ εἰσόδια ἑορτάζομεν."
185. "οὗ τὴν σύλληψιν ἑορτάζομεν."
186. "οὗ τὴν σύναξιν ἑορτάζομεν."
187. "ὧν τὴν σύναξιν ἑορτάζομεν."
188. Commemorated on September 26.
189. "ἧς [ἡ οὗ] καὶ τὴν μνήμην ἐπιτελοῦμεν."
190. "τιμίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ."
191. "οὗ τὴν ὕψωσιν [ἢ τὴν εὕρεσιν, τὴν πρόοδον, κλπ.] ἑορτάζομεν."
192. "Ὁ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν."

gically. As long as this also happens in the correct manner, namely, let us not listen to solecisms like those which the "Observer"[193] mentions in one of the older volumes of "Ὁ Ἐφημέριος," namely, "the Exaltation of the Precious Cross . . .," "the Nativity of the Forerunner . . .," and so forth, as if the "Exaltation" and the "Nativity" were saints who intercede on our behalf (Ὁ Ἐφημέριος, vol. 2 [1953], p. 44).[194] However, for this reason, a little preparation and attention is required by our priests.

175

Which prayer must be said behind the ambōn during the Liturgy of Basileios the Great? The usual one, "O Lord, who blesses those who bless you . . ."[195] or "O Christ our God, who accepts this rational and bloodless sacrifice as a sacrifice of praise and well-pleasing worship from those who call upon you with all their heart . . ."[196] as some Hieratika record? Or must the latter be said only on January 1st?[197]

According to the printed liturgical books, this issue is as follows: The older printed editions of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great in the Euchologia and Hieratika usually have only the prayer, "O Lord, who blesses those who bless you . . .." However, we also encounter the other one, "O Christ our God, who accepts . . .," in certain old, printed editions, such as in the 1811, 1852, and 1876 printed editions of the Liturgies of Venice. In the printed edition of G. Prōtopsaltidēs (Constantinople, 1858), which was "meticulously" scrutinized and enriched with notes by Patriarch Kōnstantios I from

193. "Παρατηρητής."

194. The citation for the entire article is: Παρατηρητής, "Ἀπὸ τὰ λάθη μᾶς," Ὁ Ἐφημέριος 2 (1953): 43–47.

195. "Ὁ εὐλογῶν τοὺς εὐλογοῦντας σε, Κύριε . . ."

196. "Ὁ θυσίαν αἰνέσεως καὶ λατρείαν εὐάρεστον, τὴν λογικὴν ταύτην καὶ ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν προσδεχόμενος παρὰ τῶν ἐπικαλουμένων σε ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ, Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . ."

197. For a recent study of the prayer behind the ambōn, see Robert F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Vol. V, The Communion, Thanksgiving, and Concluding Rites*, OCA 281 (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2008), 592–698.

Sinai, not only is this prayer not published, but in a footnote its reading is condemned: "The prayer behind the ambōn in the Liturgy of Basileios the Great found in some liturgical books, 'O Christ our God, who accepts . . .,' as not a composition of the Saint, must not be read, and I do not know how it was inserted into this Liturgy without ecclesiastical approval. This is concluded since this prayer is found neither in ancient manuscript scrolls, which contain the Liturgy of the Saint, nor in his complete works, which were published in Venice in the year of the Lord 1535" (second edition by N. Prōtopsaltidēs in Constantinople, 1875, p. 142).[198] Contrariwise, in the edition of N. Papadopoulos (M. Saliveros), the prayer, "O Christ our God, who accepts . . .," is assigned as the normal prayer behind the ambōn of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great, while the prayer, "O Lord, who blesses those who bless you . . .," remains in a secondary position and is said in place of the preceding one "if the priest wishes" (pp. 83–84).[199] Nevertheless, in the printed edition of the Great Euchologion under the supervision of the same person,[200] the first prayer is not published, but there is a reference to the page of the service book of the Liturgy that we referenced previously.[201] According to the Typikon of G. Violakēs, the prayer, "O Christ our God, who accepts . . .," is said only on January 1st "by exception," but on other days where the Liturgy of Basileios the Great is cele-

198. Ν. Κ. Πρωτοψαλτίδης, *Αἱ Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι τῶν ἐν Ἁγίοις Πατέρων ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου καὶ Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου σὺν τῇ τῶν Προηγιασμένων, μετὰ τοῦ Λυχνικοῦ Ὄρθρου, καὶ τοῦ Ἱεροδιακονικοῦ, Ἀκριβῶς ἐπιθεωρηθεῖσαι καὶ πλουτισθεῖσαι δι' ὑποσημειώσεων περιέργων, παρὰ τοῦ παναγιωτάτου καὶ σεβασμιωτάτου Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Κωνσταντίου τοῦ Α'. τοῦ ἀπὸ Σινᾶ* (Κωνσταντινούπολις: ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1875). Kōnstantios I of Constantinople (1770–1859, r. 1830–1834).

199. *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία: περιέχουσα τὸν Ἑσπερινόν, τὸν Ὄρθρον, τὴν Προσκομιδή, τὰς τρεῖς Λειτουργίας Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου καὶ Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου καὶ τῶν Προηγιασμένων, ὡς καὶ πολλὰ ἄλλα χρήσιμα εἰς τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ διακόνους. Ἐπιμελείᾳ Νικ. Δ. Παπαδοπούλου, Πρεσβυτέρου Ἐφημερίου Ἁγίου Γεωργίου (Καρύτση)* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχ. Σαλίβερος, n.d.), 83–84.

200. Νικ. Δ. Παπαδοπούλος, Πρεσβύτερος Ἐφημέριος Ἁγίου Γεωργίου (Καρύτση).

201. *Εὐχολόγιον τὸ Μέγα: ἀναθεωρηθὲν καὶ διὰ παντοίων σημειώσεων καὶ νέων εὐχῶν πλουτισθέν. Ἐπιμελείᾳ Νικ. Παν. Παπαδοπούλου, Πρωτοπρεσβυτέρου* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Ἰ. Σαλίβερος, 1927), 70.

brated, the customary prayer "O Lord, who blesses those who bless you . . ." is said ("During all Sundays of Lent, when the Liturgy of Basileios the Great is celebrated the usual prayer behind the ambōn of Chrysostomos is said, since the so-called one of Basileios the Great is not found in the manuscripts; but this prayer alleged of the Heaven-revealer[202] is said, by exception, so to speak, on January 1st on the Holy Mountain," edition of M. Saliveros, in Athens 1921, p. 338, n. 23).[203] The Typikon of the prōtopsaltēs Kōnstantinos does not at all deal with our topic.[204] From the Typikon of Violakēs, the *Calendar-Typikon of the Church of Greece,*[205] as well as the printed editions of the Hieratikon that were done by it,[206] received this notation, "On January 1st instead of this one, [namely, "O Lord, who blesses those who bless you . . ."], the reading of the following prayer ["O Christ our God, who accepts . . ."] is customary" (see Hieratikon, 1951 edition, p. 136; 1962, p. 201; and 1968, p. 144). The archbishop of Athens Chrysostomos (of Philippi and Neapolis) of blessed memory, follows nearly the same rubric in his *Hierotelestikon* (Athens, 1948, p. 200), with the difference that at the relevant point of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great he places the prayer, "O Christ our God, who accepts . . ." and writes in a footnote, "The prayer behind the ambōn published on p. 149 in the Liturgy of Saint Chrysostomos, 'O Lord, who blesses those who bless you . . .,' is usually said. The prayer behind the ambōn given below is usually said only on January 1st."[207] The Hieratikon of the 1950 edition from

202. "ὁ οὐρανοφάντωρ" (heaven revealer) is an epithet of Saint Basileios the Great.

203. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 338, n. 23.

204. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874).

205. *Ἡμερολόγιον-Τυπικὸν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος).

206. The Church of Greece.

207. Χρυσόστομος Φιλίππων καὶ Νεαπόλεως, *Ἱεροτελεστικόν* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1948), 200. In the note of Chrysostomos, the correct page number should be 151 instead of 149 for the text of "O Lord, who blesses those who bless you . . ." in the 1948 *Hierotelestikon.*

Rome, p. 214, has the prayer, "O Lord, who blesses those who bless you . . .," and notes, "but if the priest wishes, instead of the prayer that had been mentioned before, he says the following," and then cites the prayer, "O Christ our God, who accepts . . .."[208]

Let us now examine the witnesses of the manuscripts. In almost all the known manuscripts that contain the Liturgy of Basileios the Great, the reading of the prayer, "O Lord, who blesses those who bless you . . .," is provided as the prayer behind the ambōn, which is indeed characterized in the *Codex Sinai 1020* from the twelfth–thirteenth century as a "Prayer behind the ambōn of Saint Basileios." The prayer, "O Christ our God, who accepts . . .," is rarely encountered either alone or after the former prayer, as in the codices of *Patmos 105* from the thirteenth century, *National Library of Athens 767* and *828*, and *Byzantine Museum of Athens 135*, all from the eighteenth century. Of the eighty-three manuscripts that Professor Trempelas used in the publication of *The Three Liturgies* (Athens, 1935), the prayer, "O Lord, who blesses those who bless you . . .," exists in seventy-nine, and the prayer, "O Christ our God, who accepts . . .," only in the four above.[209] This same prayer also exists in *Codex 712 Patmos* from the thirteenth century, where it is entitled, "Prayer behind the ambōn of Basileios the Great." In some codices, another prayer behind the ambōn in the Liturgy of Basileios the Great is found, "O Master Jesus Christ our savior . . .,"[210] which is also published in a footnote on the above page in the *Hierotelestikon* of Archbishop Chrysostomos. The most ancient surviving Byzantine Euchologion, the *Codex Barberini 336* from the eighth century, has the prayer, "What praise or what hymn or what thanksgiving . . .,"[211] for the Liturgy of Chrysostomos, which indeed it entitles, "Prayer

208. *Ἱερατικὸν περιέχον τὰς Ἀκολουθίας τοῦ Ἑσπερινοῦ καὶ τοῦ Ὄρθρου, τὰς θείας καὶ ἱερὰς Λειτουργίας Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου, Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου καὶ τῶν Προηγιασμένων, μετὰ τῶν συνήθων προσθηκῶν* (Rome: n.p., 1950), 214–215.

209. Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας*, Texte und Forschungen zur Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Philologie no. 15 (Ἀθῆναι: Ἡ ἐπιστημονικὴ ἐπιτροπὴ πρὸς ἀναθεώρησιν καὶ ἔκδοσιν τῶν λειτουργικῶν βιβλίων, 1935), 154–160, 192–194.

210. "Δέσποτα Ἰησοῦ Χριστὲ ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν . . ."

211. "Ποῖον αἶνον ἢ ποῖον ὕμνον ἢ ποίαν εὐχαριστίαν . . ." For the text of the prayer, see Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Eucologio*

behind the ambōn of Chrysostomos," but has a variant of the usual prayer ("O Lord our God, save your people")[212] in the Liturgy of Basileios the Great. The prayer, "O Christ our God, who accepts . . .," is found also in this same codex (folio 258v–259v) as a prayer behind the ambōn "of the Presanctified."

From what we wrote it appears that the tradition as regards the prayer behind the ambōn of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great is quite unstable both in the manuscripts and the printed editions. The numerically greater number of witnesses leans toward the prayer, "O Lord, who blesses those who bless you . . .." It is obvious that the prayer, "O Christ our God, who accepts . . .," does not belong to the original form of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great and is not a composition of this Father; however, for the same reasons, neither also does the common prayer, "O Lord, who blesses those who bless you . . ." appear to belong to this Liturgy. In any case, the preservation of the prayer, "O Christ our God, who accepts . . .," on January 1st is somewhat curious. If this is done on account of the first of the year, it would be unjustified because the prayer has no relation to this day.[213] Still, if this was for the commemoration of Basileios the Great, namely, as a genuine composition of Saint Basileios, then its replacement with the other prayer would also not be justified on the remaining days when this Liturgy is celebrated.[214] But if the criterion of authenticity ought to apply in our case, then, with the same logical principle, many other prayers or other texts from our worship also ought to be removed. However, liturgical practice is not based on the authenticity of the texts, namely, whether they have been written by this or that author whose name they bear, but on the

---

Barberini Gr. 336, Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 273.2.

212. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, σῶσον τὸν λαόν σου . . ." For the text of the prayer, see Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336,* Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 21.3.

213. Phountoulēs is making a distinction between the first day of the secular calendar year and that of the ecclesiastical year, namely, the Indiction on September 1st, from which the prayer in question was taken.

214. The commemoration of Saint Basileios the Great takes place on January 1st.

practice and tradition of the Church, which adopts these texts and formally uses them in its worship. Moreover, most services or their individual elements are introduced into our liturgical books anonymously without this diminishing their authenticity.

Specifically, regarding the prayer, "O Christ our God, who accepts . . . ," there is not only the historical view of the matter, but also a theoretical one. This is a very beautifully composed and powerful prayer that our liturgical tradition has connected with the Liturgy of Basileios the Great and, whether it is completely historically correct or not, it became prevalent for its reading to be said during this Liturgy, either at all times, or only on January 1st, or to be left to the preference of the celebrant. I have the opinion that we must not leave unexploited the opportunity that the flexibility of the tradition provides us. We have a need for this variation in our Liturgy. We hear on a daily basis the prayer, "O Lord, who blesses those who bless you . . . ." If the other prayer was heard ten times during the year, it would also provide some variation to the entire atmosphere that the Church seeks through the celebration of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great on those days.[215] Moreover, for the people, as this Liturgy is celebrated nowadays, it differs from the usual Liturgy of Chrysostomos only during the long parts, "He gave it to his holy disciples and apostles . . ."[216] and "All creation rejoices in you, O full of grace . . . ."[217] Indeed, it must be noted that the variation of the prayer behind the ambōn is absolutely consistent with the ancient liturgical tradition of the Church. Nowadays, there exist three such prayers in use, if we also add the prayer behind the ambōn of the Presanctified, "O Master Pantokrator, who fashioned all creation in wisdom . . .,"[218] to the two from the Liturgies. We also already noted a fourth that is associated with the Liturgy of Basileios the Great. Nevertheless, there are at least twenty known manuscripts, which were written from the eighth century up until also the sixteenth

215. According to the tradition of the Orthodox Church, the Liturgy of Basileios the Great is celebrated ten times during the liturgical year (including Vesperal Liturgies).

216. "Ἔδωκε τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ μαθηταῖς καὶ ἀποστόλοις . . ."

217. "Ἐπὶ σοὶ χαίρει, κεχαριτωμένη . . ."

218. "Δέσποτα παντοκράτορ, ὁ πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν ἐν σοφίᾳ δημιουργήσας . . ."

century, that contain a multitude of prayers behind the ambōn, whose number approaches one hundred. These were once used not only during the Liturgy of Basileios the Great, but even during the Liturgy of Chrysostomos. There exist prayers for all the year's great feasts of the Lord and of the Mother of God, for many Sundays, and for many saints' commemorations. For many of these, there exist two or three prayers to be said by choice. Namely, this is a case of a true wealth that unfortunately remained unexploited. I mention a few: A prayer behind the ambōn for the Birth of the Theotokos, the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, the Archangel Michaēl, the Synaxis of the Bodiless, the Sunday before the Birth of Christ, the Eve of the Nativity, the Nativity, the Circumcision, the Meeting, the Annunciation, the Sunday of the Prodigal, the Saturday of Meatfare, the Sunday of Cheesefare, all the Sundays of the Fast, the Saturday of Lazarus, Palm Sunday, Great Thursday, Great Saturday, Pascha, the Monday and Tuesday of Renewal Week, Mid-Pentecost, the Ascension, Pentecost, the Sunday of All Saints, the Transfiguration, the Dormition of the Theotokos, the resurrection days, apostles, prophets, martyrs, blessed ones, commemoration of saints, the Forerunner, a penitential day, Sundays, and many others. These prayers have been published in various printed editions. It appears that a common prayer for the remaining days was: "O Lord, who blesses those who bless you . . .," for this reason also it became prevalent.

Short of writing that an effort ought to take place for the restoration of these prayers to liturgical use, we confine ourselves to underscoring how the preservation of at least the prayer, "O Christ our God, who accepts . . .," in the Liturgy of Basileios the Great would be exceptionally useful and consistent with the liturgical tradition.[219]

219. Author's footnote: The reverend elder, Archimandrite Gabriēl, abbot of the Sacred Monastery of Dionysiou of the Holy Mountain, is in favor of reading the prayer, "O Christ our God, who accepts . . .," in the Divine Liturgy of Basileios the Great (see *Ὀρθόδοξος Τύπος*, May 15, 1973, p. 5). Translator's note: For additional information on the abbot Gabriēl, see Constantine Cavarnos, *Blessed elder Gabriel Dionysiatis (1886-1983): Remarkable confessor and spiritual guide, profound analyst of twentieth century society, inspiring writer on many vital topics, and for forty years Abbot of the Monastery of Dionysiou at the Holy Mountain of Athos: A comprehensive account of his life, character, thought,*

176

Apostolic canon sixty-six prohibits fasting on Saturdays.[220] In the case in which a Christian is going to commune of the undefiled mysteries on Sunday, does this canon apply or is he obligated to fast on Saturday?

We wrote elsewhere (see the answer to question sixty) regarding the topic of fasting before holy communion. We briefly repeat that fasting before communion, namely, the eucharistic fast that is provided for by ecclesiastical tradition and the canons, is that which is observed by our priests. Namely, the complete abstention of food from the supper of the preceding day, or after midnight, up until the time of holy communion. The fast of three or more days or less, prior to communion is unknown in the old tradition, but likely has its origins during the years of the Tourkokratia[221] and is due on the one hand to the attempt for the most perfect as possible preparation, while on the other hand to the faithful's approach to the mystery at infrequent intervals.[222] The association of the believer's preparation for holy communion with fasting must be left to the guidance of the spiritual father, since it is useful and advisable as long as it contributes to the better preparation of the Christian, but produces many problems that cannot be solved with a general rule. Our goal must be also the goal of the Church, namely, our drawing the faithful to the mystery of life and not distancing them from it, especially nowadays when everything pushes people in the opposite direction. If we desire to look at matters objectively, we must admit that the three-day fast constitutes an inhibiting barrier for the faithful's approach to holy communion. The fast is not easily possible for people who live in the world, lead a family life, and work hard

---

and works (Belmont, MA: Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 1999).

220. The canon states, "If any clergyman might be found fasting on the Lord's Day, or on Saturday (except for one only), let him be defrocked; but if a layman, let him be excommunicated" (Rhallēs and Potlēs, 2:84).

221. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

222. In Greece, there are variety of local traditions regarding preparation for holy communion, which include a three-day fast as a most prevalent one.

for their bread. Besides, the most fervent faithful who commune the most often—and all of our efforts must aim towards this—are virtually unable to fast three days weekly or biweekly, aside from the appointed ecclesiastical fasts, in order to approach the mystery. The spiritual father knows the circumstances of each one personally and will arrange individually what each one must observe separately, and whether he judges it appropriate to also combine the modern multiday fast. These points concern the practical view of the matter.

From the viewpoint of the sacred canons, fasting before holy communion conflicts with the prohibition of fasting on Saturdays and Sundays as well as during Renewal Week. We referenced the relevant canons in the aforementioned answer. For the faithful who do not approach regularly, care must be taken for them to commune after a period of fasting so that their fasting does not conflict with these canons. On the Holy Mountain, the monks commune as a group on Saturdays in order to combine fasting and the observance of these canons. But we cannot recommend this for the people. Only those who do not work have spare time on Saturday morning.[223] Some spiritual fathers disregard the canons that forbid fasting on Saturday by invoking the scriptural text, "the inferior is blessed by the superior" (Hebrews 7:7); "the inferior" in question is the canons and "the superior" is holy communion. The same problem is posed during communion on the Nativity, Holy Apostles, and Dormition, when the eve coincides with Saturday or Sunday, as well as during Renewal Week. Others prefer the observance of the canons, namely, the consumption of "wine and oil" during lunch and xerophagy during the supper of Saturday or of the other days from the preceding instance.[224] I think that the issue is more correctly resolved according to the latter manner. Thus, while the inviolable

223. At the time of this writing (in the 1970s), even public schools were in session on Saturday mornings, and most people worked in Greece on Saturdays.

224. The canon has a definition of fasting that includes abstinence from oil and wine. Consequently, by consuming oil and wine during the first half of Saturday, the canon is being observed and so is the requirement for Holy Communion—fasting from the evening prior—by consuming a "full" fasting meal on Saturday evening.

Eucharistic fast is observed, complete abstinence from food from midnight up until holy communion is also somewhat combined with the modern custom of the longer fast and the canons are not violated by the more recent practice.

Let me also still repeat, that the issue falls within the responsibility of each believer's spiritual father. Confessors know not only the special circumstances of spiritual children, but also have the discernment to not place burdens on the shoulders of Christians, which neither they themselves bear.

Regarding this topic, we refer to two recent books: the most reverend monk Theodosios Hagiopavlitēs, *The Ignored Treasure*, Thessaloniki, 1971, and the most reverend monk, Theodōrētos Hagioreitēs, *Eucharistic Participation on the Holy Mountain*, Holy Mountain-Athens, 1972.[225]

177

Is the baptism of a child permitted when its mother is newly pregnant?

178

When there is an unbaptized infant in a family and a member of this family dies, must the unbaptized infant be baptized before the funeral of the deceased takes place?

These are superstitions unworthy of discussion. The mystery of holy baptism only concerns the child and has no relation to other persons of the family, nor to the condition of its mother nor to the life or death of other relations according to the flesh. Indeed, in the second case, the entire psychological climate before the removal of the deceased would not be suitable for the mystery to be celebrated in a fitting manner and its celebration ought to be avoided at that time, unless there is a risk to the life of the baby.

225. Θεοδόσιος Ἁγιοπαυλίτης, *Ὁ ἀγνοημένος Θησαυρός* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Ἁγίου Νεκταρίου, 1971); Θεοδώρητος Ἁγιορείτης, *Ἡ εὐχαριστιακὴ συμμετοχὴ ἐν Ἁγίῳ Ὄρει* (Ἅγιον Ὄρος/Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1972).

179

How is the cycle of the Sundays of Luke determined and why is the sequence of these Sunday gospel pericopes not followed strictly, as occurs for John and Matthew, but the Sixth is assigned, afterwards, the Fifth, the Ninth, the Thirteenth, and so forth?

The question above is one of the most difficult that this column encountered. This is because this complex and peculiar phenomenon of the cycle of the Sundays of Luke was always a murky problem for this writer, regarding which he could not find a logical and acceptable explanation. The questions that long ago have been posed by two reverend priests gave him an opportunity to research pertinent points and to record his conclusions and hypotheses below.

And first, let us see how the Typikon in use regards the topic. The reading of the Gospel according to Luke begins from the Monday that follows the Sunday after the Exaltation, namely, the earliest on September 16 (if the Exaltation coincides with a Saturday, in which case the Sunday after the Exaltation is September 15) and the latest on September 22 (if the Exaltation coincides with a Sunday, in which case the Sunday after the Exaltation is September 21). According to the system of the cycle of gospel pericopes, the First Week of Luke next begins, which is concluded with the First Sunday of Luke, which would accordingly move between September 22 and 28. This is the starting point. The weekday gospel readings follow the normally fixed sequence hereafter, while the readings for Sundays do not.

The first disruption occurs with the Fourth Sunday. This is placed on the Sunday of the Holy Fathers of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, between October 11 and 17, whether it is normally its sequence or not. A second change of sequence happens with the Fifth Sunday. This one is set always between October 30 and November 5. A third change occurs with the Tenth and Eleventh Sundays. These are placed prior to the Sunday before the Birth of Christ; the Eleventh is the Sunday of the Forefathers[226] (December 11–17) and the Tenth is the Sunday preceeding it. The intermediate ones are

226. "ἡ Κυριακὴ τῶν Προπατόρων."

completed with the remaining Sundays in their numerical sequence, from which only the Twelfth Sunday of Luke is omitted. The left-over Sundays remain for the gap between the Sunday after the feast of Lights and the beginning of the Triōdion. If this Sunday is a single one, then the gospel for the Fifteenth Sunday of Luke is read; if two, then the Twelfth and the Fifteenth of Luke; if three, four, five, or at the upper limit six (according to the New Calendar), then on the first three Sundays the gospels of the Twelfth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth of Luke are read and the remaining ones are supplied from among the final unread gospels of Matthew (Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Sundays). An exception is noted if December had five Sundays, in which case on the first one, which always falls between December 1 and 3, the Gospel for the Fourteenth Sunday of Luke was read; then it is not read again in January, but it is completed by the above-mentioned gospels of the Sundays of Matthew.

Two representative examples will make the matter clearer:

1) If the Exaltation of the Precious Cross coincides with a Saturday:

September 15: Sunday after the Exaltation.

September 16: Monday of the First Week of Luke.

September 22: First Sunday of Luke.

September 29: Second Sunday of Luke.

October 6: Third Sunday of Luke.

October 13: Fourth Sunday of Luke (of the Holy Fathers).[227]

October 20: Sixth Sunday of Luke (the Fifth would be read later).

October 27: Seventh Sunday of Luke.

November 3: Fifth Sunday of Luke (between October 30 and November 5).

November 10: Eighth Sunday of Luke.

November 17: Ninth Sunday of Luke.

November 24: Thirteenth Sunday of Luke (the Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth are transferred).

227. "τῶν ἁγίων Πατέρων."

December 1: Fourteenth Sunday of Luke (December has five Sundays).

December 8: Tenth Sunday of Luke (before the Sunday of the Forefathers).

December 15: Eleventh Sunday of Luke (of the Forefathers).

December 22: Sunday before the Birth of Christ.

Then in January we will have:

January 12: Sunday after the Feast of Lights.

January 19: Twelfth Sunday of Luke (if we have more than one Sunday).

January 26: Fifteenth Sunday of Luke (the Fourteenth was previously read).

The remaining Sundays are from Matthew corresponding to the proximity of the Triōdion.

2) When the Exaltation of the Precious Cross coincides with a Sunday:

September 21: Sunday after the Exaltation.

September 22: Monday of the First week of Luke.

September 28: First Sunday of Luke.

October 5: Second Sunday of Luke.

October 12: Fourth Sunday of Luke (of the Holy Fathers).

October 19: Third Sunday of Luke.

October 26: Sixth Sunday of Luke (the Fourth was read before, the Fifth is transferred).

November 2: Fifth Sunday of Luke (between October 30 and November 5).

November 9: Seventh Sunday of Luke.

November 16: Eighth Sunday of Luke.

November 23: Ninth Sunday of Luke.

November 30: Thirteenth Sunday of Luke (the Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth are transferred).

December 7: Tenth Sunday of Luke (December has four Sundays).

December 14: Eleventh Sunday of Luke (of the Forefathers).

December 21: Sunday before the Birth of Christ.

And in January:

January 11: Sunday after the feast of Lights.

January 18: Twelfth Sunday of Luke (if we have more than one Sunday).

January 25: Fourteenth Sunday of Luke (it was not read during December).

February 1: Fifteenth Sunday of Luke.

And if there are also other Sundays between February 1 and the Sunday of the Publican and Pharisee, they are completed from Matthew.

In the examples above, some Sundays coincide with feasts, on which, according to the Typikon, the gospel of the Sunday is not read but that of the feast, as for example on November 16 (of the evangelist Matthew), November 30 (of the apostle Andrew), and so forth. However, the sequence of pericopes is not influenced by this and follows its taxis provided as though the gospel of the Sunday was read. Namely, in the second example, November 16 is the Eighth Sunday of Luke. On this Sunday, this pericope would not be read, but the gospel for the commemoration of the evangelist Matthew. The Sunday following is not the Eighth of Luke, but normally, the Ninth of Luke. This is because both pericopes were read, according to the ancient Typika, as is done even up until nowadays on the Holy Mountain.

Two Sundays of Luke do not present problems, and for this reason, we did not mention them above. They are the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Sundays of Luke. The first is that of the Publican and Pharisee and the second is that of the Prodigal Son. These are always placed in their standard position, namely, at the beginning of the Triōdion.

The kanonia of Emmanouēl Glyzōnios (which are found in his "Evangelistarion" printed at the end of the Gospel book), as well as

the Typikon in force, of the prōtopsaltēs Kōnstantinos[228]and Geōrgios Violakēs,[229] determine this sequence for the Sundays of Luke on the basis of the relevant tradition. One can also read relevant material in the study of Metropolitan Gennadios (Arampatzoglou) of Ilioupolis in his study, "Foundations and Guidelines for construction of the kanonion for every year with relevant tables" in the periodical *Orthodoxia*, vol. 13 (1938), pp. 376–386 and vol. 14 (1939), pp. 15–24 and 54–57,[230] as well as in the introductions of *Taxis of the Sacred Services* from the years 1956 and 1957 by Geōrgios Bekatōros.[231]

This retrospection into prevailing practice and the understanding of the complex framework that it follows, although not pleasant, is indispensable for us to be able to note the problems and attempt their solution, to the extent possible.

Let us now pose the questions that are raised for us in connection with the whole picture, which the cycle of the Sundays of Luke gives us:

1. Why does the Gospel of Luke begin from the Monday after the Sunday after the Exaltation of the Precious Cross?
2. Why is the Sunday of the Holy Fathers connected with the pericope of the Fourth Sunday of Luke?

---

228. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874). Emmanouēl Glyzōnios or Glyzounios (Ἐμμανουὴλ Γλυζώνιος or Γλυζούνιος) (1540–1596), born in Chios and resident in Venice, was known as a publisher and editor of liturgical books, including the *Psalter* (1586), *Gospel* (1588), *Anthologion* (1588), *Mēnaia* for September and October (1595), and *Mēnaia* for November (1596), (Χ. Γ. Πατρινέλης, "Γλυζούνιος, Ἐμμανουήλ," *ΘΗΕ* 4:567–568). He is credited with construction of lectionary guides in various editions of the Evangelistaria.

229. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921).

230. Γεννάδιος (Ἀραμπατζόγλου), "Βάσεις καὶ ὁδηγίαι διὰ τὸν καταρτισμὸν τοῦ κανονίου ἑκάστου ἔτους μετὰ σχετικῶν πινάκων," *Ὀρθοδοξία* 13 (1938): 376–386, 14 (1939): 15–24.

231. Γεώργιος Μπεκατώρος, *Τάξις τῶν Ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν 1956: κατὰ τὸ Τυπικὸν τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1956), 3–11; and *Τάξις τῶν Ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν 1957: κατὰ τὸ Τυπικὸν τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας"* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1957), 5–13.

3. Why is the gospel reading of the Fifth Sunday of Luke read on the Sunday that would fall between October 30 and November 5?
4. Why is the gospel reading of the Tenth Sunday of Luke placed on the Sunday before that of the Forefathers?
5. Why is the gospel reading of the Eleventh Sunday of Luke read on the Sunday of the Forefathers?
6. Why is the gospel reading of the Twelfth Sunday of Luke transferred to the Sunday following the Sunday after the feast of Lights? and,
7. Why, if there exists only one Sunday between the Sunday after the feast of Lights and the Sunday of the Publican and Pharisee, is the gospel reading of the Fifteenth Sunday of Luke preferred?[232]

To begin with, it is necessary for us to keep in mind two things: First, that this complication within this whole entire sequence of the Sundays of Luke cannot be contemporary with the original arrangement for the system of the cycle of pericopes. Originally, matters must have been as simple as also the sequence for the Sundays of John and of Matthew. Otherwise, the compilers of the Kyriakodromion[233] would have given another form to this section, one more practical and consistent with the particular requirements that they would have had for certain Sundays. Secondly, that the system for the assignment of pericopes is two-fold, namely, for each Sunday, it includes an epistle and a gospel reading which are read together. In other words, the cause for the transfer of a gospel reading of one Sunday to another Sunday cannot be found in the gospel reading, but rather in the epistle reading that is connected with this pericope. Namely, what applies nowadays in the case of the Sundays of the Triōdion, of the Pentēkostarion, and of Matthew, where every Sunday has a fixed gospel pericope and a fixed epistle, also applied

232. From the preexisting sequence of gospels for the Sundays of Luke.

233. κυριακοδρόμιον, τό (pl. κυριακοδρόμια, τά), kyriakodromion (pl. kyriakodromia). This term can designate a book containing the cycle of gospel and epistle readings for Sundays and pertinent homilies, or the cycle of Sunday gospel and epistle readings in general.

for the Sundays of Luke. It must be noted that in the old tables for the assignment of pericopes, the Sundays are not numbered as nowadays, First, Second, Third Sunday of Matthew, and so forth, First, Second, Third Sunday of Luke, and so forth, but continuously, just as more or less also the epistles in the relevant liturgical book, from the Sunday of All Saints (First Sunday after Pentecost) up until the Thirty-third Sunday[234] (the Sunday of the Publican and Pharisee), with double readings for each Sunday (epistle–gospel). This harmony was prevalent up until the eighteenth century, when Deacon Neophytos of Kasos corrected the kanonia of Glyzōnios, but incorrectly prescribed what related to the cycle of epistle readings, when he connected them with the tones, the eōthina gospels, and the prokeimena, and not with the gospel pericopes, with which they were originally connected.[235]

Now we come to the questions:

1. Why does the Gospel of Luke begin from the Monday after the Sunday after the Exaltation of the Precious Cross?[236]

As we saw at the beginning, the reading of the Gospel of Luke begins on the Monday after the Sunday after the Exaltation, namely, it fluctuates between September 16 and 22. Consequently, the First Sunday of Luke will coincide either on the twenty-first of this month or on the first Sunday after the twenty-first. This point is not without importance. September 23 (an equinox) was the birthday of the emperor Augustus and a beginning of the new year. From Kōnstantinos the Great (313) up until nearly the end of the fifth century, this was the beginning of the Indiction. On this day, the celebration of the conception of the Forerunner was established, the first event of the evangelical narrative. Luke is the only one of the

234. The text incorrectly has this Sunday as the Twenty-third after Pentecost.

235. Neophytos, a hierodeacon of the eighteenth-century resident in Jerusalem, was said to have been from the Aegean Island of Kasos. According to an account repeated in various Evangelistaria, the hierodeacon was attributed a major role in a liturgical reform under Patriarch Chrysanthos (Notaras), (Χρύσανθος [Νοταράς]), of Jerusalem (r. 1707–1722) through the publication of kanonia in Evangelistaria for the epistle and gospel readings of the ecclesiastical year.

236. The questions were not repeated in the text but are added for clarity.

evangelists who relates this event, as well as other events from which the period of the New Testament begins (Annunciation of the Theotokos, visit to Elisabeth, the birth of the Forerunner). Since from this point of view, his Gospel is the first in the series of the Gospels, its reading began with the new year. The first Sunday of the new year was the First Sunday of Luke. It is quite possible that before the transfer of the beginning of the new year to September 1, which came into force for the first time on September 1 of the year 462, the position of the Gospel of Luke was already established at the beginning of the year according to the older calendar. This will also be confirmed by what we present below. The ancient Typika and Mēnologia note, "September 23, the new year and the conception of Saint Elisabeth" and that Luke begins "on the Monday of the first week of the new year." When the old New Year's Day (September 23) was forgotten, this rubric took its present-day form, "on the Monday after the first Sunday after the Exaltation of the Cross" and the beginning of the Gospel of Luke was thus connected with the Exaltation of the Precious Cross. In the Typikon of the Monastery of the Most holy Theotokos of the Evergetis, (*Codex National Library of Athens 788* from the twelfth century), it is noted: "It is necessary to know that Luke the Evangelist begins to be read from the Sunday after the Exaltation; for at that time also the equinox takes place, which is called the new year; or that it is read from the twenty-third of the month September . . . since Luke begins on the first Saturday and first Sunday of the new year, beginning first from the previous Monday."[237] This rubric of the Typikon of the Evergetis represents the transitional stage from the first of the year to the Sunday after the Exaltation.

2. Why is the Sunday of the Holy Fathers connected with the pericope of the Fourth Sunday of Luke?

On October 11, the commemoration of the Holy Fathers of the Seventh Ecumenical Council in Nicea (787) was celebrated. According to the Typikon of the Great Church of Christ from the

237. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, September to February*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.5 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2000), 86–87.

tenth century (*Codex T. Staurou 40*), the synaxis of the Holy Fathers was solemnly celebrated in Saint Sophia and the all-night vigil was celebrated "from the evening."[238] The feast was consistently observed on October 11. A gospel of the day was read, "You are the light of the world . . ." (Matthew 5:14–19). According to the custom of the Great Church, the feast was later transferred to the nearest Sunday, just as it is also done up until nowadays. Next it appears that the gospel of the Fathers ceased to be read, which was already read on the Sunday of the Fathers of the Fourth Ecumenical Council in July, and a new pericope was sought from the Sundays of Luke within the period of which their commemoration fell. The same thing also happened with the Sunday of the 318 Fathers of the First Ecumenical Council on the Seventh Sunday from Pascha, where a gospel is again read from the evangelist of that period (John 17:1–13) and for the Sunday of the Fathers of the Fourth Ecumenical Council from Matthew (5:14–19). Why now was the parable of the Sower (Luke 8:5–15) selected, namely, the pericope of the Fourth Sunday of Luke? Most simply, it was the nearest relevant pericope from the gospels of the Sundays of Luke to the feast of the Fathers. Between the gospel of the Third Sunday of Luke (raising of the son of the widow of Nain) and the parable of the Sower on the Fourth Sunday, which are both Sundays that can fall within the interval of October 11–17, where the Sunday of the Holy Fathers fluctuates, the second one is incomparably more suitable. The seed of God's word, the obstacles for its growth, the weeds, the thorns, the times of temptation, the bearing of fruit, are themes having indisputable relevance to the Fathers, councils, and heresies, at least more than the resurrection of the dead son of the Third Sunday. Moreover, the change was small. Whenever the Fourth Sunday did not fall during the specified period, but rather the Third coincided, they mutually swapped the pericopes for these two Sundays.

3. Why is the gospel reading of the Fifth Sunday of Luke read on the Sunday that would fall between October 30 and November 5?

238. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:66–67.

This third problem is the most difficult one. The gospel reading of the Fifth Sunday of Luke (Luke 16:19–31) narrates the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. What relationship can this narrative have to the period, October 30–November 5, in which it is sought to be placed by so many leaps and bounds?

The Typikon of the Evergetis gives us the first indication. Its rubric is somewhat different from the present-day one but casts some light on our research. Here is what it notes for October 31: "It is also necessary to know this, that on the Sunday before the month of November, the epistle reading to the Hebrews, 'Brethren, having confidence . . .' [Hebrews 10:19–31] is read in the Liturgy. The gospel reading according to Luke, 'The Lord said this parable, there was a certain rich man . . ..'[239] Alleluia plagal of fourth tone, 'O Lord in your anger rebuke me not.'[240] Verse, 'Have mercy on me, O Lord, for I am weak.'"[241] On the basis of the common elements from the epistle reading, gospel, and allēlouarion, if anyone wished to try to find a theme for this Sunday, one would come to the conclusion that this is a day of "compunction," repentance, and contrition regarding the remembrance of some event that is related to the fire of hell and the punishment of sinners. On November 6 in the synaxaria, the "commemoration" or "remembrance" is mentioned "of the ash that was brought down with love for humankind" or "of the falling ash, namely, of balsam" or "the dust that was brought down." This event occurred in Constantinople during the reign of Leo I (457–474), precisely on November 6 of the year 472.[242] The chronographers and

239. Luke 16:19.

240. "Κύριε, μὴ τῷ θυμῷ σου ἐλέγξῃς με."

241. "Ἐλέησόν με, Κύριε, ὅτι ἀσθενής εἰμι." Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, September to February*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.5 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2000), 162–163.

242. For a discussion of volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, and their effects on the Typikon of the Great Church, see Brian Croke, "Two Early Byzantine Earthquakes and their Liturgical Commemoration," *Byzantion* 51 (1981): 122–147; Mark Roosien, "The Liturgical Commemoration of Earthquakes in Late Antique Constantinople: At the Intersection of Ritual, Environment, and Empire" (PhD diss., The University of Notre Dame, 2018); Antti Arjava, "The Mystery Cloud of 536 CE in the Mediterranean Sources," *DOP* 59 (2005):

the synaxaria describe the incident with the most fearsome colors, which was considered as a threat of God against sinners, who also thanks alone to His patience were also once again saved. The couplet lines in verse of the Mēnologion for the day are characteristic: "You threaten to burn, but once more do not burn; You mingle patience with wrath, O Word." Here is the description of a synaxarion: "For around the midday hours, after the entire heaven became cloudy, when the customary darkness of rainclouds changed into a fiery spectacle, it seemed that everything would burn up. For it shocked all in such a manner, as even to appear by sight alone that, if rain too might be brought down from such clouds, assuredly it also would be like the flame that completely burnt Sodom as before. On account of this indisputable expectation of all who fled for refuge to the sacred sanctuaries with lamentations and supplications, the philanthropic Lord who transcends sins, forgives unrighteousness, and does not desire the death of sinners,[243] when mingling goodness with punishment, commanded the clouds to rain an unfamiliar and strange rain, and which created fear in those sinning; for beginning from the evening hours it extended until midnight; the ash brought down was black, most exceedingly hot very much like that of a smoky furnace, and great in size, as to be found above the land and deposited a thick layer of more than a human hand on the roof tiles; it burnt and consumed the herbs and plants rising from the earth; it became quite hard to wash out, signifying the wrath of God and representing sin . . .." It is well-known nowadays that the falling of this fearful ash came from the eruption of Mount Vesuvius, which took place at the time. The testimony of the ancient Typikon of the Great Church from the tenth century establishes the indisputable relationship of this event to the choice of pericopes. On November 6, in remembrance of this event, according to the above Typikon, a procession took place and, after this, a Liturgy, with these readings

73–94; Glanville Downey, "Earthquakes at Constantinople and Vicinity, A.D. 342–1454," *Speculum* 30 (1955): 596–600; and Emanuela Guidoboni, *Catalogue of ancient earthquakes in the Mediterranean area up to the 10th century* (Bologna: Istituto Nationale di Geofisica, 1994).

243. Compare Ezekiel 18:23; 33:11.

precisely as we saw them indicated in the Typikon of the Evergetis. A note from the Typikon of Saint Sophia resolves the issue without dispute: "One ought to know that on the Sunday before the commemoration of the falling dust is done on the sixth of the present month, the epistle is read, Hebrews (10:19–31). Gospel according to Luke (16:19–31)."[244] This standard rubric explains precisely why the pericope of the Fifth Sunday of Luke is located between October 30 and November 5; the Sunday before November 6 always falls during this time interval. The "commemoration of the ash" was transferred to a Sunday precisely for the reason which we saw above for the Sunday of the Holy Fathers. With analogous criteria, this pericope was chosen; it was the one most suitable for this occasion out of the other adjacent pericopes of the Sundays of Luke. The formation of the sequence of pericopes must have been completed before 472. The epistle pericope (Galatians 2:16–20) that was read together with the parable of the rich man and Lazarus was not consistent with the new theme. According to the above-mentioned Typikon, for this reason, the pericope, Hebrews 10:19–31, was placed on this Sunday, which originally, as we saw, was the pericope for November 6, the remembrance of the ash.

4. Why is the gospel reading of the Tenth Sunday of Luke placed on the Sunday before that of the Forefathers?
5. Why is the gospel reading of the Eleventh Sunday of Luke read on the Sunday of the Forefathers?

The gospel reading of the Tenth Sunday of Luke (the woman bent double[245]—Luke 13:10–17) is read on the Sunday that precedes the Sunday of the Forefathers.[246] The gospel of the Eleventh Sunday of Luke (parable of the supper—Luke 14:16–24) is read on the Sunday of the Forefathers. The development of the festal calendar cycle for the Nativity has a long history. Originally, this feast was bounded by two Sundays—just as the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross and that of the feast of Lights—the Sunday before the Birth of Christ and the Sunday after the Nativity. Afterwards, this cycle began

244. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église,* 1:90–91.
245. "τῆς συγκυπτούσης." (BDAG, s.v. "συγκύπτω").
246. "τῶν Προπατόρων."

to develop in imitation of the preparatory period for Pascha, but it did not reach the same dimensions. The Sunday of the Forefathers was added first. It originated from a repetition of the theme of the Sunday before the Nativity, for which reason during both Sundays the commemoration of the ancestors of Christ according to the flesh is celebrated. Both were originally called Sundays "of the Holy Fathers."[247] In order to distinguish them, the name, "Sunday before the Birth of Christ,"[248] was used for the older one, which took on a more pronounced forefeast character, and that "of the Holy Fathers"[249] for the newer one. Finally, the term, "Sunday of the Forefathers"[250] was preferred in order that confusion be avoided with the Sundays of the Holy Fathers of the Ecumenical Councils. The Fathers here are Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as the subject of the day prescribed by many manuscripts, especially Abraham the First Ancestor.[251] We find remnants of the emphasis on the commemoration of Abraham even in the present-day service, especially in the synaxarion of the Sunday that exclusively refers to this patriarch. By transfer from December 17, the commemoration of Daniel the Prophet and the Three Holy Youths was added to this theme according to the custom that we saw earlier. In the meantime, the forefeast period of the Nativity was extended even further. The forefeast troparia nowadays begin to be chanted from December 6. In this interval of the forefeast, another Sunday also frequently fell, which fluctuated between December 4–10, the Sunday before the Sunday of the Forefathers. This Sunday also now began to acquire a forefeast character.

A gospel reading for these two preparatory Sundays was again sought out from among the preexisting sequence of gospels for the Sundays of Luke. The pericope had to have some connection with the theme of the forefathers or at least with Abraham. From the nearest Sundays of Luke only that of the Tenth Sunday speaks about the "daughter of Abraham" (Luke 13:16). It is very possible that this

247. "τῶν ἁγίων Πατέρων."
248. "Κυριακὴ πρὸ τῆς Χριστοῦ Γεννήσεως."
249. "τῶν ἁγίων Πατέρων."
250. "Κυριακὴ τῶν Προπατόρων."
251. "ὁ γενάρχης."

phrase drew this pericope to the forefeast period of the Nativity. We have a multitude of connections of such a kind between biblical texts and subjects of feasts in our divine worship. Regarding the Sunday of the Forefathers, a more practical explanation would be that they preferred the parable of the supper (Eleventh of Luke), not in connection with the forefathers, but as preparatory for holy communion, to which the faithful were accustomed to approach *en masse* during the Nativity. However, it is more probable that the parable of the supper is assigned in connection with the words of the Lord, "many will come from the east and the west and will recline with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of the heavens" (Matthew 8:11). Indeed, an attempt took place for the introduction of the pericope that contains this phrase on the Sunday of the Forefathers (Matthew 8:5–13), as attested to by several manuscripts, but finally they preferred to stay with the pericopes of the sequence of Luke. When the gospel reading of the Eleventh Sunday of Luke was connected with the Sunday of the Forefathers, a more suitable epistle reading was sought than that originally associated with the pericope of the supper (Ephesians 6:10–17), and Colossians 3:4–11 was considered as such, which speaks about the future appearance of Christ.

6. Why is the gospel reading of the Twelfth Sunday of Luke transferred to the Sunday following the Sunday after the feast of Lights?

The Twelfth Sunday of Luke's transfer to the Sunday following the Sunday after the feast of Lights is possibly due to the epistle pericope with which it was connected in the ancient tables for the assignment of pericopes. This pericope is taken from the epistle to the Colossians, 1:12–18 (of the twenty-eighth Sunday). In this pericope, it is possible for one to find connections with the themes of the feast of Lights, which are: thanksgiving to God who enabled human beings to be freed from the darkness and to live in the light, of the love of God in the kingdom of the Son, through whom—Christ, who is the image of God and the first-born of all creation and head of the Church—we have redemption and the forgiveness of sins. All

this can be interpreted as allusions to the divine manifestation, to the testimony of the Father, to the beginning of Christ's preaching, to the baptism that was bestowed on the feast of Lights, and to the theme of the light, after which the feast was also named. I think that this explanation is quite logical.

7. Why, if there exists only one Sunday between the Sunday after the feast of Lights and the Sunday of the Publican and Pharisee, is the gospel reading of the Fifteenth Sunday of Luke preferred?[252]

Finally, the preference for the gospel reading of Fifteenth Sunday of Luke is explained by its proximity to the period of the Triōdion. While the gospel for the Sixteenth Sunday of Luke is the parable of the Publican and Pharisee, here the gospel is the incident of Zacchaeus; repentance and, through this, salvation. This was also the theme for the epistle reading of this Sunday, "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners" (1 Timothy 1:15–17). The Fifteenth Sunday of Luke is the connection between the two periods.

180

How were they introduced and what is the significance of the particles that are placed on the holy paten during the prothesis? Are they changed into the Body of Christ?

181

According to the standard rubrics, the priest elevates the lamb during, "Let us attend. The Holy Things are for the holy."[253] Some priests elevate the entire paten. Is this correct?

182

Why does the priest not commune from the particle which he excised specifically for himself at the prothesis, but only from the

252. From the preexisting sequence of gospels for the Sundays of Luke.
253. "Πρόσχωμεν· τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις."

lamb? In such a case, what meaning does the excised particle have for the priest who is serving?[254]

The above three questions are referring to the topic of the particles that are excised during the service of the prothesis and placed alongside the lamb on the paten. The first question relates to the history and meaning of the particles and their sanctification; the third one to the communion of the priest or even of the faithful from them; and the second to a related topic, namely, the elevation also of the particles during the exclamation, "Let us attend. The Holy Things are for the holy."

As is well known, up until even the thirteenth century during the service of the prothesis, the priest excised and placed on the paten the lamb alone. Even during the fourteenth century, it is attested by many manuscripts that after the excision of the lamb, its crosswise incision, the piercing, and the pouring of the wine and water into the chalice, the priest immediately set the asteriskos on the paten and covered the gifts. In codices of this period, the elevation of other prosphora began to also appear at the prothesis, apart from that from which the lamb was excised, in honor of the Precious Cross, the Theotokos, archangels, Forerunner, as well as other saints if there were other prosphores[255] or if there was a need for an elevation of others, obviously as many of which would be anticipated to be sufficient for the distribution of the antidōron at the end of the Divine Liturgy. However, particles were not excised in the honor of these persons. There is introduced during the same period, both the commemoration of the names for the living and those who have died, and the elevation of prosphora on their behalf, without also again the excision of particles on their behalf.

The *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* from the twelfth–thirteenth century (*Codex National Library of Athens 662*) precisely presents this taxis. Namely, after the commixture and before the covering of the gifts, "[the priest] takes the other prosphora and says, 'Accept,

254. See also questions 518, 529, and 591.

255. Phountoulēs is using the words, "τῶν προσφορῶν," (the genitive of "οἱ προσφορές") which more properly is translated as "offerings."

O Lord, this sacrifice through the intercessions of our most blessed Lady Theotokos and ever-Virgin Mary.' Next, he takes the third prosphora and says, 'of the honorable, heavenly bodiless powers; of the honorable, glorious prophet, forerunner and Baptist John; of the holy and all-laudable apostles' and he mentions various names. And for the fourth prosphora he commemorates the saint being celebrated, in which after saying the name of the saint of the day, he says, 'and of all your saints. And remember, O Lord, our Archbishop [name], our most pious and Christ-loving emperors [names], your servant [name, that is to say, of the abbot] and all the brothers . . . and all those previously fallen asleep . . .' Next, he commemorates as many living and dead as he wishes."[256]

In the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Patriarch Philotheos (fourteenth century), we find the oldest clear witness for combining the commemorations as described above with excisions of particles. The differences from present-day practice are evident: "the priest taking the second prosphora in his hands says, 'In honor and commemoration of our most blessed Lady Theotokos and ever-Virgin Mary, by whose intercessions . . ..' And taking a particle with the holy lance, he places it on the left-hand side of the holy bread. At the third prosphora he says, 'By the power of the precious and life-giving cross; of the honorable bodiless powers of heaven . . . and of all your saints by whose supplications . . . .' And in this way, taking the particle, he places it on the same side, namely, he places it in a row to the left below the other particles. Next, taking another prosphora, he says, 'For every episcopate of the Orthodox . . ..' Next, the priest says each name of the living and excises a particle for the latter in another prosphora when saying in this way, 'For the remembrance and forgiveness of the sins of those of the blessed . . .' and excises a particle. The deacon himself taking a prosphora and the holy lance also says in this way, 'Remember, O Lord, my unworthiness . . .' and he places the particles on the place below the holy bread, just as also the priest."[257] During almost the same period, Nikolaos Kabasilas

256. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 3–4.
257. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 2–4.

speaks about the "offering"[258] also of other breads "to the glory of the Panagia Mother of God, apart from the first prosphora from which the lamb is excised; for an intercession of this or that saint; for forgiveness of sins of the souls either of the living or the dead"[259] and the excision and offering "of each particle"[260] (*Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, chapter 10).

In the years after the *Diataxis* of Philotheos, the number and placement of the particles took their present-day form: the particle for the Theotokos is placed right of the lamb, the nine particles of the saints (the "ranks") left, and the particles of the living and the dead below. Symeōn of Thessaloniki (d. 1429) and the liturgical manuscripts from the same period attest with minor variations to our contemporary practice. Symeōn is the first one who also gives us the meaning of this practice. The particles are set in place of the saints both for their honor and for sanctification, but are not changed into the Body of Christ, nor certainly even into the body of the saints, in honor of whom they have been excised. I cite a characteristic excerpt from his *Dialogue*: "Do you understand that the particles are in place of the saints? And that they are offered in memory and honor of them and for our salvation through them? For they also share in this awe-inspiring mystery as those who have fought together for Christ, their glory and exaltation being greater by their communion in the saving sacrifice, and they reconcile and join us to Him, and even more so inasmuch as we commemorate them. However, the particles are not transformed into either the Master's Body or into the bodies of the saints, but they are only gifts and offerings and sacrifices by means of bread in imitation of the Master and are offered to Him in the name of the saints. They are sanctified by the sacred-service of the mysteries, by the union, and by communion, and pass along

258. "προσαγωγήν," Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 10.1 in *Nicholas Cabasilas: Explication de la Divine Liturgie*, eds. René Bornert, Jean Gouillard, and Pierre Périchon, and trans. Sévérien Salaville, 2nd edition, SC 4bis (Paris: Cerf, 1967), 92.

259. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 10.3 (SC 4bis:92–93).

260. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 10.12 (SC 4bis:96–97).

holiness to those for whom they are offered, and, through those for the saints, to us, just as this also happens through prayers . . .. For while [the saints] are being directly sanctified by God, receiving offerings from us they sanctify us through them . . .. For if they share immaterially and spiritually in the communion of Christ by their souls, then also through His sacred-service, which He has handed down to take place for the world, they share the greatest glory, as fellow laborers and those glorified with Him" (chapter 94).[261] And in his *Explanation* he notes: "Accordingly, a discussion has come down to us from the Fathers that the offered particles provide great advantage, for they are in place of persons for whom they are offered, and are a sacrifice offered on their behalf to God, just as the priest says in offering them: 'Receive, Lord, this sacrifice.' The particles offered for the saints, then, are for their glory and honor, and their ascent in worthiness and greater acceptance of divine illumination" (chapter 102).[262]

The purpose of the offering of particles for the living and dead is analogous. And these particles are offered in place of the persons, "for the faithful who have 'fallen asleep,' they are for the remission of sins, and the union of divine grace, while those for the living, provided they lead lives of repentance, are for the deliverance from torments, for the forgiveness of sins, and for hope of eternal life" (*Explanation*, chapter 102),[263] or "since they are offered for us the humble who are in need of propitiation and intercession and await the great mercy of God" (*Dialogue*, chapter 94).[264]

Again, the same Symeōn expresses in a masterful manner the whole spiritual meaning that this marvelous depiction of the paten of our Divine Liturgy encloses: "But let us see how both through this divine symbol and through the action of the sacred proskomidē we behold Jesus Himself and His Church all as one. With Christ the true light at the center, the Church has obtained life eternal and is

261. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 216–219 (modified).

262. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 158–159.

263. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 158–161 (modified).

264. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 222–223.

enlightened and sustained by Him. For He is in the center through the bread on the paten, while his Mother is at his right hand through the particle, and the angels and saints are to the left; below is the whole pious gathering of those who believe in Him. And this is the great mystery: God among men and God in the midst of gods, deified by the one truly God by nature, who was incarnated for them. And this is the kingdom of the age to come and the reign of eternal life; God with us whom we both see and of whom we partake" (*Dialogue*, chapter 94).[265]

Precisely the contact of the particles with the precious Body and certainly the union with the divine Blood unites with Christ and sanctifies the whole body of the Church, the saints and the sinful faithful, for whom the mystical sacrifice is offered. Characteristic is the phrase that by tradition accompanies the transfer of the particles into the chalice, "Wash away, O Lord, by your Precious Blood, the sins of your servants who are here remembered."[266] In his *Explanation*, Symeōn precisely theologizes this: "For, lying right next to the Divine Bread as it is being sacrificed in the sacred-service and becomes the Body of Christ, the particle offered for someone itself also partakes immediately of His holiness. Placed in the chalice, it is united with His Blood. Therefore, it passes on the grace to the soul for whom it was offered. A spiritual communion therefore takes place. If the person is one of those who strive for devotion or who have sinned and are repenting, he receives in an unseen manner the communion of the Spirit in the soul, as we said. Often the person also obtains physical benefits, as we have learned. But if someone is

265. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 230–231.

266. "Ἀπόπλυνον, Κύριε, τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τῶν ἐνταῦθα μνημονευθέντων δούλων τῷ αἵματί σου τῷ τιμίῳ, πρεσβείαις τῶν ἁγίων σου." In the 2018 edition of the Divine Liturgy published by the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, the text reads, "Ἀπόπλυνον, Κύριε, τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τῶν ἐνταῦθα μνημονευθέντων δούλων τῷ αἵματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ, πρεσβείαις τῆς Θεοτόκου καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων σου" (translated, "Wash away, O Lord, by your precious Blood, the sins of your servants here remembered, through the intercessions of the Theotokos and all your saints)," Greek Orthodox Archdiocese, *The Divine Liturgy of our Father among the saints John Chrysostom, Large Clergy Edition* (New York: Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, 2018), 47.

actively sinful, has not rejected his sins and is unfit for communion, the sacrifice for him will be for his condemnation" (chapter 103).[267] So much for the history and the meaning of the particles.

We summarize what we have written: The particles of the prothesis are excised and offered for the honor of the saints and for propitiation for the living and the dead. With the entire ritual, they are sanctified and convey sanctification to all the members of the Church, which also they symbolically represent.

Are they changed into the Body of Christ? We saw that Symeōn of Thessaloniki clearly teaches that they are not changed into "the Master's Body."[268] The lamb alone is changed, which is also the only bread that was originally offered in the prothesis, the "one bread," which "we break," because "one bread, one body, but we are many; for all of us partake of the one bread," according to the apostle Paul (1 Cor 10:16–17). With this teaching of Symeōn, who summarizes the Orthodox Church's belief on this point, later Fathers also agree, such as Theophilos of Kampania in the *Treasury of Orthodoxy* (chapter 17), Saint Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain in the *Rudder* in a footnote to canon twenty-eight of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, and other authors of canonical–liturgical collections.[269]

Somewhat unclear are the things said regarding this in the Byzantine commentary on the Divine Liturgy, *Ecclesiastical History and Mystical Contemplation*, which usually goes under the name of Germanos I, Patriarch of Constantinople (715–730). It does not directly mention the particles but appears to assume that there are also other pieces of prosphora on the paten aside from the lamb. This evidence would be the chronologically oldest witness concerning the offering of particles, if the tradition of this text was not so unstable and if there were not so many doubts concerning its authorship[270]—and no one can discern what in this text belongs to Saint Germanos

267. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 160–161.

268. "σῶμα δεσποτικόν."

269. Ἀγάπιος ἱερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 243, n. 2.

270. The word, "πατρότητα," also has the implication of "alignment with the Fathers."

and what does not. However, in any event, Germanos calls these particles "parts and members of the Body" of Christ and accepts that the lamb also imparts sanctification to them, obviously by its contact with them. However, what kind of sanctification, like that which Symeōn understands or a consecration that changes them into the Body of Christ? We will see below the entire passage from Germanos. Kabasilas likewise is not so clear or at least he does not appear to make a clear distinction between the lamb and the particles: "For every offering of gifts takes place in remembrance of the Lord and His death occurs through the whole [offering]" (*Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, chapter 10).[271] The unclear witnesses above would normally not have mattered because the teaching of the Orthodox Church in this case is unanimous and clear, at least from Symeōn onwards, had not the Greek-rite Uniate churches taken a different position on this subject. Theologians, councils, and Pope Benedict XIV decreed that the entire content of the paten—lamb and particles—is transubstantiated during the consecration into the Body of Christ.[272]

271. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 10.1 (SC 4bis:92–93).

272. Benedict XIV, *Ex Quo Primum* (1 March 1756), § 40 in *The Papal Encyclicals 1740–1878*, ed. Claudia Carlen (Wilmington, NC: McGrath Publishing, 1981), 1:91, "But among the schismatics it is generally accepted that Simeon, Archbishop of Thessalonica, betrayed certain doubts about the consecration of the particles in his treatise *de Sacramentis*. But everyone can easily see how unreasonable his doubting was. The priest at the sacred altar pronounces the form of consecration over the smaller particles no less than over the larger piece. Since his intention is equally aimed at consecrating all of them, and the matter of all of them is suitable for sacramental transformation, the smaller particles must certainly be consecrated too if the larger piece receives consecration." For a general overview of the work of Benedict XIV, see Maria Teresa Fattori, "Benedict XIV and His Sacramental Polity on the Eastern Churches (1740–1758)," *Nicolaus, Rivista di Teologia Ecumenico-Patristica*, 39 (2012): 117–144. In describing Catholic conciliar activity affirming the consecration of the particles, Martin Jugie states, "Catholici vero ritus byzantini in communionem fidelium τὰς μερίδας consecrare solent," Martin Jugie, *Theologia Dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium ab Ecclesia Catholica Dissidentium*, (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1930), 3:223. The legislation of the Catholic Council of Zamośc (1720) in affirming the consecration of the particles is discussed by J. Bocian, "De modificationibus in textu slavico liturgiae S. Ioannis Chrysostomi apud Ruthenos subintroductis," in

Perhaps this preoccupation with the question of whether the particles are consecrated or not seems somewhat scholastic. However, the resolution of this issue has immediate practical liturgical consequences. The answer to the two questions below depends on what position we take on this first and basic point at issue.

Does the lamb alone or the whole paten have to be elevated? Without any doubt, only the lamb, given that it alone is changed into the Body of Christ. All the manuscripts of the Divine Liturgy and all the rubrics that describe it speak explicitly: "he elevates the Bread," "he takes the Precious Body into his hands and elevates it," "he elevates the Bread in a crosswise manner," "making the sign of the cross over the holy paten with the Holy Bread," "holding the Holy Bread with the tips of the fingers of both hands, he elevates it, making the sign of the cross above the holy paten," "he takes the Holy Bread with the three fingers of both hands and he elevates it a hand's length," and so forth. According to the testimony of Jacob of Edessa (seventh century), the priest elevated the Holy Bread and displayed it to the people "for proof."[273] This is precisely the meaning of the elevation as it is expressed also by the exclamation which follows, "the Holy Things for the holy"; the invitation of the worthy and the repulsion of the unworthy from the Body of the Lord being displayed. "Holy are the presented gifts, having received the visitation of the Holy Spirit; holy also are you who are accounted worthy of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, the Holy Things are suitable for the holy" (Kyrillos of Jerusalem, *Mystagogic Catechesis* 5.19).[274] Nikolaos Kabasilas also expresses this meaning: "And when about also to come to the table himself and to summon others, since the communion of the mysteries is not indifferently allowed to all, he also does not call all, but

XPYCOCTOMIKA: Studi E Ricerche Intorno a S. Giovanni Crisostomo a Cura Del Comitato Per Il Xvo Centenario Della Sua Morte (Rome: Pustet, 1908), 951–955.

273. "εἰς μαρτύριον."

274. Kyrillos of Jerusalem, *Mystagogic Catechesis* 5.19 in *Catéchèses Mystagogiques*, ed. Auguste Piédagnel and trans. Pierre Paris, SC 126 (Paris: Cerf, 1966), 168. Compare the translation, "The offerings are holy, because they have received the descent of the Holy Spirit, and you are holy too because you have been granted the Holy Spirit," in Edward Yarnold, *Cyril of Jerusalem*, The Early Church Fathers (New York: Routledge, 2000), 186.

taking and displaying the Life-giving Bread, he calls to communion those worthy of partaking of it, 'The Holy Things,' he says, 'for the holy,' all but saying, 'Behold, the Bread of Life which you see. So then, hasten to partake, but not all, only if one is holy. For the Holy Things are allowed only for the holy'" (*Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, chapter 36).[275]

The meaning of the elevation of the Body of the Lord upon the cross, His death, even His Resurrection and Ascension, is given by the Byzantine commentators of the Divine Liturgy to the elevation of the Holy Bread: "The Body is elevated in the hands of the priest, as upon the cross" (Iōannēs of Damascus, *Concerning the flesh and blood of Christ*, 5),[276] "The elevation of the Precious Body represents the elevation upon the cross and His death on it and the Resurrection itself" (Theodōros of Andida, *Summary Commentary concerning the symbols and mysteries occurring in the Divine Liturgy*, chapter 37),[277] "The elevation of the Life-bearing Bread takes place, which typifies the crucifixion of the Savior for us, the coming of Christ, and His sharing Himself with us, because it is He who was crucified for us. It also shows to us mystically Him who suffered for us. Therefore, [the deacon] also cries out, 'Let us attend!' so that we perceive the mystery. And the [main celebrant] adds, 'The Holy Things for the holy,' representing that the Crucified One is Holy, and that the partakers of Him should take care to be holy" (Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Dialogue*, chapter 99).[278]

From all the above, the conclusion is evident. The lamb alone is elevated, not only because it was originally alone on the paten, but also because it alone is changed into the Body of Christ and consequently it is displayed in order that the invitation to communion be exclaimed, and the elevation of it alone depicts the elevation of the Lord upon the cross. For precisely the opposite reasons, the whole paten is not elevated, namely, also the particles. Germanos explains

275. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 36.1 (SC 4bis:222–223).

276. PG 95:409d.

277. PG 140:464d.

278. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 254–255.

in his commentary why precisely they are also not elevated: "The elevation of the Precious Body represents the elevation on the cross, the death on it, and the Resurrection itself. Elevating the Divine Bread alone, that is to say, since He is the Lord King and 'He is the head,' according to the apostle.[279] But the other precious gifts [are] members of Christ, and Body of Christ, that is, [members] of the Precious Body of Christ God. For it[280] is that alone in which the divine and life-bearing passion of Him who was sacrificed for the life of the world is typified and displayed; since indeed this Divine Bread alone is slaughtered as a lamb is sacrificed, but the other particles of the divine gifts are not pierced with a lance in a crosswise manner, but as members and parts of the Body, they are apportioned out and slaughtered. Therefore, that Divine Bread when partaking of sanctification also communicates that to the other precious gifts; likewise, it also communicates sanctification and grace to the chalice."[281]

Now finally, *why does the priest not commune from his particle, but from the lamb*? Most simply because his particle is not changed into the Body of Christ, not only this, but also the faithful must commune from the lamb and not from their particles or from the particles of the saints. Symeōn also precisely states this: "It should be known that in the communion of the most awe-inspiring mysteries the priest must take care to receive not from the particles, but from the Lord's Body, and must likewise give communion from it to those coming forward. However, since by the union of the All-holy Blood all things become one, there is communion with the Lord's Blood even if someone receives communion by means of a particle. But since every one of the faithful should receive communion in both the Body and Blood of Christ, let the priest, taking the Lord's Body with the Blood in the labis, give communion [in this way] to the one coming forward. It is also true that all the particles placed in the chalice have received a share of both the Body and Blood of Christ, and he who partakes of them, which are joined with these things, communes of His Body and Blood; yet it is better, I think, to watch

279. 1 Col 1:18.
280. The Divine Bread.
281. PG 98:448d–449a.

for and to take of the Divine Body with the labis" (*Dialogue*, chapter 94).[282] Theophilos of Kampania draws the priest's attention to this: "However, the priest must pay attention not to give communion to the faithful from these particles, but from the Body of Christ, otherwise he sins greatly and almost falls into idolatry" (*Treasury of Orthodoxy*, chapter 17).[283] Gabriël Sevēros,[284] metropolitan of Philadelphia, in a dedicated treatise, "Concerning the particles," precisely formulates the same teaching: "Therefore, it should be known that nothing from the aforementioned particles—even though it is unified with the Body and Blood of the Lord—is changed into the Flesh and Blood of Christ. For only the bread and the wine, which were offered in remembrance of the passion of the Lord and His Resurrection, are transubstantiated and changed. The particles share in the sanctification by participation. For this reason, let the priest be attentive, that he does not distribute to the communicants the particle in place of the Body of the Lord. For just as the souls of the saints are all around the light of divinity, they themselves do not become God by nature, but rather by participation, so also the particles, even though they are united with the Flesh and Blood of the Lord" (*Enchiridion*, Venice 1776, p. 24).[285] Blessed Nikodēmos says

282. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 222–223.

283. Θεόφιλος, Ἐπίσκοπος Καμπανίας, *Ταμεῖον Ὀρθοδοξίας περιέχον συνοπτικῶς καὶ διαλαμβάνον περὶ Θεοῦ, περὶ Πίστεως, περὶ ἐξηγήσεως καὶ χρήσεως τῶν ἑπτὰ Μυστηρίων, δέκα Ἐντολῶν, καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαιοτέρων τῆς Ἱερᾶς Ἐκκλησίας ἐθίμων*, 7th ed. (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, n.d.), 49–50.

284. Gabriël Sevēros (Γαβριὴλ Σεβῆρος), (before 1540/41–1616), was born in Monemvasia with his primary education in Crete, travelled in Italy eventually living for a short time in Padua and Venice, and then was elected metropolitan of Philadelphia in 1577, but settled for the remainder of his life in Venice. He is famous for many theological works including writings on calendar reform, disputes with Latin theologians on the Filioque, and the Eucharist. For an overview of his life and work, see Gerhard Podskalsky, *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft (1453–1821), Die Orthodoxie im Spannungsfeld der nachreformatorischen Konfessionen des Westens* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1988), 118–124.

285. The treatise is found in, Γαβριὴλ Σεβῆρος, *Κατὰ τῶν λεγόντων, τοὺς ὀρθοδόξους τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας υἱοὺς κακῶς τε καὶ παρανόμως ποιεῖν τῷ τιμᾶν καὶ προσκυνεῖν τὰ ἅγια δῶρα, ἡνίκα ὁ χερουβικὸς ἄδεται ὕμνος καὶ ὁ ἱερεύς, φέρων ταῦτα, εἰσοδεύει εἰς τὸ ἅγιον βῆμα. Ἔτι περὶ τῶν μερίδων, ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ δίσκῳ*

the same in his footnote to the referenced canon of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, just as also other canonical–liturgical collections. To avoid the distribution of particles instead of the precious Body, in cases of an approach *en masse* to holy communion, the particles, as it is well known, are not placed into the chalice after the communion of the priest, but after the distribution to the people.

The above-mentioned theory of the Uniates that the particles are transubstantiated into the Body of Christ obviously aimed at circumventing this difficulty. Moreover, the abolition of the labis by them and the distribution of communion by the hand of the priest who took the piece of the Holy Bread, dipped it into the chalice, and placed it in the mouth of the communicant required the preparation in the prothesis of special pieces, according to the pattern of small Latin hosts, and for this reason, the entire contents of the paten ought to be consecrated.

183

While all the saints are mentioned in the dismissals and the various prayers, why are not the four evangelists mentioned? Should not also "of the holy glorious four evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John,"[286] be added to the dismissal after, "of the . . . apostles"[287]?

The questioner perceives, so to speak, an injustice that is done to the evangelists, namely, the sacred men who, with the writing of the gospels when inspired by the Holy Spirit, illumined the world, and offered a service to the Church, which other exceptionally honored saints did not offer.

However, the story of the formation of our Church's Heortologion and of the honor that was bestowed by it to various saints

---

ἐπιτιθεμένων. Ἔτι περὶ τῶν κολύβων καὶ σπερμάτων, τῶν προσφερομένων ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς τῶν Ἁγίων καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν κεκοιμημένων ὀρθοδόξων, 2nd ed. (Venice: Giovanni Antonio Pinelli, 1604; Venice: Nikolaos Glykis, 1786), 22–25. For a discussion of this work, see Podskalksy, *Griechische Theologie*, 121–122.

286. "τῶν ἁγίων ἐνδόξων τεσσάρων εὐαγγελιστῶν Ματθαίου, Μάρκου, Λουκᾶ, καὶ Ἰωάννου."

287. "τῶν . . .ἀποστόλων."

demonstrates that it was little influenced by theological criteria of such a type. In the development of the liturgical honoring of the saints, popular criteria contributed more. Saints were more honored that the people loved because of their miracles, cures, and help, which they received from them, such as from the healing and military saints (Nikolaos, the Unmercenaries, Geōrgios, Dēmētrios, the Theodōroi, and so forth) or because their names reminded the people of some attribute that was ascribed to them (Ἐλευθέριος/Freedom, Θεράπων/Healer, Φανούριος/Revealing, and so forth). Their tombs and relics, the great temples that were dedicated in their names, and the monasteries that were built by them likewise contributed. If we take into account that our Church's Heortologion was chiefly formed in Constantinople, we can easily explain why many Constantinopolitan saints or those of neighboring regions or saints who were connected in some manner with Constantinople, since their relics or temples were there, occupied a central place in our worship and in our Heortologion.

In order that the people understand the special importance of certain great figures such as apostles and the evangelists in the present case, they must have specialized theological education that they do not possess. An attempt at emphasizing the importance of these sacred persons, and a means that would contribute to this purpose would also be the introduction of their commemoration in the dismissals that the questioner proposes (in the event that this does not have popular support, it does not guarantee its success). Of the evangelists, only John happened to have particular honor, not for the theological importance of his gospel, but because his name is associated with the very well-known events of the New Testament and chiefly because he lived, and was buried, in Ephesus where his tomb and also his most splendid temple were, and on Patmos, where the famous monastery was founded by Blessed Christodoulos. The other evangelists do not even have full services (they do not have either a Litē or kathismata, and only have one canon). Indeed, other apostles for the same reasons have even more meager services and, apart from the two Chief Apostles Peter and Paul, the day for the commemoration of the others passes almost unnoticed.

For this reason, in the great dismissals, as well as the prayer, "Save, O God, your people . . ."[288] of the Litē and of Matins, and at the proskomidē, the evangelists are not commemorated by name. However, we can accept the fact that their commemoration is collectively included in the category of "the holy, glorious and praiseworthy apostles,"[289] who are commemorated in all instances. A proof of this is the fact that the four evangelists are depicted in the icons of the twelve apostles, just as they are also enumerated in the synaxarion for the Synaxis of the Twelve Apostles (June 30), while, as is well known, only Matthew and John belong to the choir of the twelve disciples of the Lord. In our ecclesiastical tradition and divine worship, apostles and evangelists are taken as one grouping.

The mention of the evangelists by name would certainly give rise for the same reasons to the not unjustified desire that also the apostles are mentioned by name. But this would bring an exhausting burden to the dismissals, which, especially as done by some priests, are quite long-winded and weighed down with a multitude of names. Inasmuch as the various categories of saints are generally commemorated, without sufficient reason there is no need to mention their names in detail.

184

In the dismissal for the funeral service, given that in the beginning we address ourselves in the third person, "Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . ." (May Christ our true God . . .), must we continue in this manner to the end "καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ κεκοιμημένου δούλου αὐτοῦ" (and the soul of his servant who has "fallen asleep")? Is not what is often heard a solecism: "καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ κεκοιμημένου δούλου σου" (and the soul of your servant who has "fallen asleep")?

"Δούλου αὐτοῦ" (his servant) is undoubtedly correct. Moreover, all the liturgical books precisely record this. The dismissal is always

288. "Σῶσον ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαόν σου . . ."
289. "τῶν ἁγίων ἐνδόξων καὶ πανευφήμων ἀποστόλων."

composed in the third person, because it is not a "prayer" (εὐχή),[290] namely a prayer (προσευχή) to God, but a blessing of the priest for the people at the end of the service. Just as also in the case of other similar blessings of our liturgical form ("May God have compassion on us . . .,"[291] "Save, O God, your people and bless . . ."[292]), the priest himself does not directly bless the people, but in a modest manner conceals himself and prays in a third person. Precisely during the dismissal, the priest prays that Christ through the intercessions of His saints may have mercy and save the faithful, but additionally in the funeral dismissal, that He may also give rest to the soul of the Christian who has fallen sleep, His servant.

Some celebrants lapse into the erroneous formulation of the funereal dismissal, "τοῦ δούλου σου" (of your servant), being misled perhaps by the two later inserted elements that enclose the dismissal, namely, "Δόξα σοι Χριστὲ ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν, ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν, δόξα σοι" (Glory to you, O Christ our God, our hope, glory to you) at the beginning and "Δι' εὐχῶν . . ." (Through the prayers . . .) at the end, which have the form of prayers (εὐχῶν–προσευχῶν), or "verses" (στίχων), as they formerly called them, and give the impression that they constitute a single unit with it.

185

The taxis requires that holy communion be given at "With fear . . .." However, if we have many people to commune, and especially children, can we commune them after the end of the Divine Liturgy so that a commotion does not occur?

There is no doubt that holy communion must be offered to the people at the time of the Divine Liturgy which is especially dedicated for it, namely, at, "With fear of God . . . draw near."[293] The Divine Liturgy is celebrated in order for the faithful to partake of the sanctification of the mysteries through communion and be made

290. The word, "εὐχή," can be a colloquial substitute for the word, "προσευχή."

291. "Ὁ Θεὸς οἰκτειρήσαι ἡμᾶς . . ."

292. "Σῶσον ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν σου καὶ εὐλόγησον . . ."

293. "Μετὰ φόβου Θεοῦ . . . προσέλθετε."

divine when being united with the Body and Blood of the Lord. Namely, the Divine Liturgy is a mystical supper and table; and the purpose of the offering and consecration of the precious gifts is the partaking of them. The offering of holy communion is not a sideline in the entire sacred rite, but its basic element, the second center of the entire celebration after the consecration. Christ was well pleased to establish the mystery of the Divine Eucharist and to change through the Holy Spirit the gifts of the Church into His Body and Blood so that we might be united with Him by partaking of them. Already immediately after the consecration this is heard, "That it may be for those who partake . . .," lest we mention the words of institution for the mystery, which are nothing other than an invitation for participating in it, "Take, eat . . .," "Drink of it all of you . . .." Immediately after the prayer of the anaphora, the systematic preparation of the faithful for holy communion begins and after it follows a series of prayers of thanksgiving for participation in it. Transferring holy communion to the end of the Divine Liturgy is liturgically inconceivable and constitutes—let the expression not be considered exaggerated—a destruction of the entire sacred-service. Namely, how could we prepare the faithful for holy communion through the prayers, invite them to it with, "The Holy Things for the holy" and "With fear . . ." and after the invitation for us to turn our backs to them and relegate them to a more opportune time? Or how will the prayers of thanksgiving[294] after the time of holy communion be justified since the people would still not have participated in it? When examined logically, the matter reaches the point of mocking God and the ecclesiastical community.

The transfer of holy communion to the end of the Divine Liturgy resulted from the habit of the faithful not frequently approaching for holy communion, while by contrast, the communion of the priest remained in its original position since he never ceased communing during the Liturgy. The communion of the faithful ended up as an exception and the priests became accustomed to turn back to the holy table after, "With fear of God . . .," without offering

294. These are the prayers that are part of the Divine Liturgy and not those that are said in private.

holy communion. When they approached *en masse* during the great feasts, the priests customarily left communion to the end in order that they might first complete the Divine Liturgy. In more recent times, they also combined the reading of prayers of forgiveness or even the anointing with unction prior to holy communion. Another reason was also the disturbance that would take place if the faithful came to the mystery at, "With fear of God . . .." However, if holy communion were to be offered then, certainly it will take place with less commotion than at the end and, with the appropriate effort of the priest, the faithful will learn to respect this sacred moment more and to approach the mystery with greater order.

In addition, some also cite the prolongation of the service with the delay that would be caused if the faithful commune at that time. Those not communing would be compelled to remain in the temple for perhaps even much longer time, if indeed those coming to holy communion are numerous. We cannot get around this difficulty; holy communion must remain in its normal place. Indeed, the sight of those coming to the mystery will be didactic for those not coming, and a *de facto* encouragement of attendance at holy communion. Time can be saved from the entire service if the longer versions of the cheroubikon, "It is truly meet . . .,"[295] and the responses of the choir at various points in the service are avoided. During the time of holy communion, instead of repeating, in a manner especially somnolent, the troparion, "Of your mystical supper . . .,"[296] the chanting of the koinōnikon can be continued as in the ancient period, either chanting an entire psalm from the service for communion (Psalms 22, 23, and 115) or from the Typika (Psalms 102, 145, 33, and 144) or the communion psalm for Sunday (Psalm 148) if it is Sunday, or the polyeleos for the Mother of God (Psalm 44) if it is a feast of the Mother of God, and so forth.[297] The middle solution that is imple-

295. "Ἄξιόν ἐστιν . . ."

296. "Τοῦ δείπνου σου τοῦ μυστικοῦ . . ."

297. Old and modern published editions of koinōnika include melodies that are "short, longer, and long" (σύντομα, ἀργοσύντομα, καὶ ἀργά) for each koinōnikon. In addition, there are melodies for some entire psalms. However, generally, greater work is needed in this area to provide adequate resources for chanters in order to act on the suggestions being made by Phountoulēs. An

mented by some priests, namely, offering holy communion at "With fear of God . . .," but to save time while they are distributing holy communion, continuing the prayers and exclamations of the Divine Liturgy, even as far as also—if there are many who approach—doing the dismissal while they still commune, is completely anti-liturgical and reprehensible. It is preferable for the few faithful that are in a hurry to leave before the Liturgy ends rather than destroying the entire sacred rite with grotesque combinations.

Specifically, it should be noted that the communion of children and especially of babies, certainly often happens to cause disorder and excessive delay. Since the people of God also consist of children who approach the mysteries, it is unavoidable that many times we also suffer their wailing, even at the time of holy communion. But with a special effort of the priest, the matter can be greatly mitigated. It would be useful for the priest to recommend to the parents, naturally if opportune, to commune their babies during the Liturgies of Saturdays or other small feasts in the middle of the week. Especially during the days of great feasts, where the faithful approach *en masse* for holy communion, it would be sensible that the communion of children at a more suitable time be recommended to the parents. Then, in agreement with the parents and the schools, it would be highly recommended for special Liturgies to be organized on appropriate days with the exclusive purpose of communing the children and babies, an effort which has been commendably undertaken by many priests and has yielded good fruit.[298] In this way, the discomfort not only of the congregation, but also of the children themselves, will be perceptibly avoided or diminished on Sundays and feasts.

---

example of recent efforts to provide such resources are the publications of the monastery of Simōnopetra on the Holy Mountain, which include entire psalms in Byzantine notation.

298. This is referring to the practice in Greece for the attendance at services by an entire school body during certain times of the year, especially at Divine Liturgy during the morning. Such "field trips" or special events are often coordinated with clergy, who otherwise may not have celebrated a service on that day.

186

Is it permitted for the priest to administer communion from the Presanctified Holy Elements to the faithful who come early to the temple before the enarxis of the Divine Liturgy on Great Thursday or Great Saturday, and are unable due to their professional occupations to remain and to attend the Liturgy?

In the preceding answer, we dealt with the related question, whether it is permitted for holy communion to be distributed to the faithful not at "With fear of God . . .," but at the end of the Divine Liturgy. The question above presents another issue, where the answer to it presupposes what we wrote there, not simply regarding the connection between communion and Liturgy, but also more especially regarding the position of holy communion within the overall organic context of the sacred ceremony.

The theoretical treatment of this issue is easy. What was said regarding the instance above applies much more to the present one. Holy communion is a fruit of the Divine Liturgy. Offering the fruit without celebrating the Divine Liturgy is an abolition of the meaning of the Holy Eucharist as a sacrifice and as a mystical synaxis and gathering of the Church as the Body of Christ for participation in the Lord's Supper. Otherwise, there would not exist a reason for the Divine Liturgy to be celebrated frequently. It would be sufficient for it to be celebrated a few times a year and on the remaining days for the faithful to commune from the Presanctified Holy Elements. That which was done by the old-time priests who, on the days of large attendance, communed those who came to holy communion from the Presanctified Gifts at whatever point of the service, before or during the Divine Liturgy, fortunately, is no longer done by newer priests. The believer must normally participate in the entire celebration of the Divine Eucharist and will commune of the mysteries at the prescribed time.

Ecclesiastical practice also knew exceptions. Saint Justin tells us that in his era (second century), after the Divine Liturgy and the communing of those present, the deacons transported the Gifts and also administered communion to those absent in their homes (*First*

Apology, 65).[299] The same thing is also done up until nowadays by our priests; they commune the sick in their homes, keeping particles from the holy communion of the Liturgy that they recently celebrated, or from the consecrated elements that are reserved in our temples for this purpose. The same thing was oftentimes done in the service of marriage, when it ceased being celebrated in connection with the Divine Liturgy, as well as in the service of holy baptism. We also have many witnesses from Christian antiquity that the faithful kept a portion of the Holy Bread from what the priest offered them in the palm during the Sunday Liturgy and communed in their homes on the remaining days of the week, as is more or less done today by many pious people with antidōron. In their hermitages, the monks did this methodically; they reserved the Presanctified Gifts from the Sunday Liturgy and communed from them in the middle of the week, either individually in the hermitages or as a group in the monasteries. The service of the typika was not originally anything other than a rudimentary form of the Presanctified, at the end of which they came and communed. The Liturgy of the Presanctified also, as is well known, is a presentation of the Precious Gifts for communion without an offering or sacrifice being performed, on fasting days during which the celebration of the Divine Liturgy is not permitted. However, in the instance to which the question refers, this standard for an exception does not apply. Great Thursday and Great Saturday are not days when the Liturgy is not celebrated, nor do our Christians find themselves in the deserts, nor also are they sick so that they are unable to come to the temple.

However, in practice there exist certain difficulties not easily understood, which we cannot ignore. Among the farming population of our countryside, the problem is not so acute. On the day that they have designated for communion, the faithful are able to so arrange their work that they can attend the Divine Liturgy and commune

299. Justin Martyr, *Apology on Behalf of Christians* 65.5. Phountoulēs follows the reference from PG 6:428b. The text reference here is from Denis Minns and Paul Parvis, eds. and trans., *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr*, Oxford Early Christian Texts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 255.

during it.[300] However, in the cities where most people work in offices or factories or with a salary, they cannot quit their work on both these days which, it must be noted are not public holidays, but indeed for many are days of intense labor. In principle, the Church applied oikonomia for these reasons. The Liturgy of Great Thursday is Vesperal, in remembrance of the Mystical Supper of the Lord that took place in the evening, and the Liturgy of Great Saturday is likewise Vesperal, because Great Saturday is a day of austere fasting and the celebration of the Divine Liturgy is prohibited during it. However, the Liturgies of these days are nowadays celebrated in the morning for the accommodation of the faithful who commune. If our Fathers saw that we celebrated the Liturgy on Great Thursday in the morning, and especially Great Saturday, they would have certainly classified us among the heretics. But nowadays we are not bothered at all by the fact that we chant Vespers at early dawn and in this manner we contravene not only the liturgical but also the natural order of the day in the name of our personal convenience. The same thing also happens on the eves of the Nativity and Theophany and with the Presanctifieds of Great Lent. Under pressure from the new conditions of life, should we now take another step and transfer the Vesperal Liturgies even earlier, so that people can finish at the time they begin work at offices or at their other activities? This would be a worsening of an existing evil. Should holy communion be offered from the Presanctified Gifts to workers before the enarxis of the Divine Liturgy and the Liturgy be celebrated in tranquility at its normal time? According to what we wrote above, this would be a worse evil. This concerns a most difficult problem, to which I do not know whether a sufficient and correct solution can ever be given. In cities, a middle solution is applied, but with many disadvantages, namely, Liturgies are celebrated only in certain temples very early, and this is announced to the people in order that workers may come to these temples early and commune, or two Liturgies are celebrated

300. In many Greek villages, the traditional custom is not to set foot in fields beginning with the afternoon of Great Thursday up until the Tuesday of Renewal Week.

even in the same temple when there are two priests, one for the workers and one at the accustomed time for the remaining people.

The ideal would be for us to return to the correct old practice, which is applied even nowadays in the monasteries. Namely, for the Vesperal Liturgies to be done in the evening because serious liturgical reasons exist that compel their celebration at this time. Difficulties existed even then, but people had a greater disposition for sacrifice. As for those who for unavoidable reasons could not be present at these Liturgies, they could be directed to come to holy communion during the Liturgy of the vigil of Pascha and not to hasten to abandon the temple as soon as "Christ is risen"[301] was heard.[302] Certainly, then, we would have another problem for us to face; the proximity of these Liturgies of Great Thursday and Great Saturday to the services of Matins of Great Friday and of Pascha, which have nowadays been transferred to the evening of the previous day. See, the divergence from correct practice creates situations and complex problems that make the road for returning to it impassable.

187

When does the sanctification of the water of the Great Hagiasmos take place, during the first or during the second blessing of the water, which is done during the reading of the prayer, "Great are you, O Lord, and marvelous are your works . . ."[303]?

In the present sanctification prayer for the water of the Great Hagiasmos, ("Great are you, O Lord . . ."),[304] there are two invocations of the Holy Spirit, which are repeated three times and are accompanied by a triple crosswise blessing of the water by the hand of the priest (and not by the handheld cross, as wrongly done by some priests).

---

301. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη . . ."

302. This refers to a modern habit that has developed in the Church of Greece and elsewhere, where many faithful leave the temple on Pascha night at the beginning of the service of the Resurrection (with the first chanting of "Christ is risen") before the Divine Liturgy.

303. "Μέγας εἶ, Κύριε, καὶ θαυμαστὰ τὰ ἔργα σου . . ."

304. "Μέγας εἶ Κύριε . . ."

In our current Euchologia, these two invocations have the following form: "Do you yourself, therefore, O King, Lover of humankind, be present even now through the visitation of your Holy Spirit and sanctify this water by your Holy Spirit,"[305] and a little further down, "Do you yourself even now, O Master, sanctify this water by your Holy Spirit."[306]

It is truly curious that there are two invocations in this sanctification prayer—namely, two consecratory points—a thing that is logically inconsistent and not encountered in any other service. In all the mysteries and in other similar sacred rites, there is only one consecration prayer, which includes only one invocation of the Holy Spirit for the blessing of the species of the mystery. After this one invocation, the species of the mystery—whether it is oil in the service of unction, or myron during the consecration of myron, or water during holy baptism, or the bread and wine of the Holy Eucharist—are now consecrated through the activity of the Holy Spirit and there cannot be a discussion regarding a new consecration hereafter, whether through a new invocation or blessing or by any other means whatsoever. Specifically, the prayer of the Great Hagiasmos, partly also of the Small Hagiasmos, has been composed according to the model of the great consecratory prayer for the Divine Liturgy, namely, the prayer of the holy anaphora. Indeed, just as also the latter, it begins with a general glorification of God that refers to His activity in the world, ("Great are you, O Lord . . . you have poured forth the air" // "It is proper and right . . . that have been bestowed upon us),[307] which concludes with a reference to the glorification of the angelic powers, ("Angelic powers . . . veil themselves" // "even though thousands of archangels stand around you . . ."),[308] The remembrance of the coming of Christ into the world follows,

305. "Αὐτὸς οὖν, φιλάνθρωπε βασιλεῦ, πάρεσο καὶ νῦν διὰ τῆς ἐπιφοιτήσεως τοῦ ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος καὶ ἁγίασον τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ."

306. "Αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν, δέσποτα, ἁγίασον τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ."

307. Great Hagiasmos: "Μέγας εἶ, Κύριε . . .τὸν ἀέρα ἐξέχεας" // Holy Eucharist: "Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον . . .τῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς γεγενημένων."

308. Great Hagiasmos: "Ἀγγελικαὶ δυνάμεις . . . κατακαλύπτεται" // Holy Eucharist: "καίτοι σοι παρεστήκασι χιλιάδες ἀρχαγγέλων."

with a special reference to baptism and the sanctification of the waters of the Jordan, while in the Liturgy, there is a special reference to the Passion and the Mystical Supper, ("For you God who is . . . dragons" // "who your world . . . coming again").[309] The invocation of the Holy Spirit follows for the consecration of the water of the Hagiasmos or of the bread and wine into the Holy Eucharist ("Do you yourself, therefore . . . filled" // "Once again we offer to you . . . by your Holy Spirit").[310] Up until this point, the prayer of the Great Hagiasmos is identical to the prayer for the sanctification of the water of holy baptism. From this point, they differ; in the second, the water here is now sanctified, and the enumeration begins of its supernatural attributes and special gifts that the baptized will enjoy in it, just as precisely also in the Divine Liturgy the fruits of the mystery are enumerated ("so that they may be for those who partake . . .")[311] after the consecration of the precious gifts has been accomplished by the invocation. For the same reason, the same thing takes place in the prayer of the Hagiasmos ("that all . . . fit benefit"),[312] but the list of benefits is interrupted by the insertion of a new reference to sacred history, which concludes with a second invocation ("For you are our God . . . Do you yourself even now . . . by your Holy Spirit").[313] After this, the enumeration of gifts through the sanctified water resumes and the prayer concludes with a commemoration analogous to the diptychs of the Divine Liturgy ("And save, O Lord . . . remember, O Lord . . ." // "And again we offer to you . . . on behalf of . . . remember, O Lord . . .")[314] and the usual doxological sealing of the prayers. It is well known that the present service of the Great Hagiasmos originated from the merging of various elements, and as it appears from the overall context, the section

309. Great Hagiasmos: "Σὺ γὰρ Θεὸς ὢν . . . δρακόντων" // Holy Eucharist: "ὃς τὸν κόσμον σου . . . πάλιν παρουσίας."

310. Great Hagiasmos: "Αὐτὸς οὖν . . πεπληρωμένον" // Holy Eucharist: "ἔτι προσφέρομέν σοι . . . τῷ ἁγίῳ."

311. "ὥστε γενέσθαι τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσιν . . ."

312. "ἵνα πάντες . . . ὠφέλειαν ἐπιτήδειον."

313. "Σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . . Αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν, δέσποτα, ἁγίασον τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ."

314. Great Hagiasmos: "καὶ σῶσον, Κύριε . . . μνήσθητι, Κύριε . . ." // Holy Eucharist: "ἔτι προσφέρομέν σοι . . . ὑπέρ . . . μνήσθητι, Κύριε . . ."

of the sanctification prayer, "For you . . . by your Holy Spirit,"[315] did not originally belong to this prayer, but was added from some other parallel prayer for the sanctification of water, just as we also have analogous examples in other liturgical texts. Moreover, this is also evident from the instability of the philological tradition of this text which, in contrast with the remaining body of the prayer, presents an unusually great number of variants, additions, and omissions in the various manuscripts. One can also see these variants in the edition of Professor P. Trempelas, *Small Euchologion*, vol. 2, Athens, 1955, p. 39.[316] However, in any event, the second invocation that is included in this section, when it was incorporated into the entire great prayer, did not have a character of an invocation, as it has nowadays. In all the old and many later manuscripts (*Barberini 336, National Library of Athens 662, 664, 670, 713, 877, 1910, 2086, S. 64, S. 573*), this phrase exhibits a small variation, but of fundamental importance, "Do you yourself even now, O Master, having sanctified/ἁγιάσας this water by your Holy Spirit, give to all those anointed . . .."[317]

Let us summarize: The prayer of the Great Hagiasmos, "Great are you, O Lord . . .," has only one invocation of the Holy Spirit, the first one, "Do you yourself, therefore, O King, lover of humankind . . .," just as also the prayer of sanctification for the water of holy baptism, the parallel prayer of the anaphora of the Divine Liturgy, and all the other mysteries have, and just as it is imperative logically and theologically. The second invocation is contained in an obviously inserted section ("For you . . .by your Holy Spirit")[318] and originally was not an invocation, or at least when it entered the previously existing prayer of Hagiasmos ceased to have a form of an invocation ("having sanctified . . .give"),[319] but likely from a copying error, took the present form in later manuscripts and printed editions, mistaken for a second invocation. For this reason, it is also

315. "Σὺ γὰρ εἶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . .Αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν, δέσποτα, ἁγίασον τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ."

316. Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 2:39.

317. "αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν, δέσποτα, ἁγιάσας τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ, δὸς πᾶσι τοῖς τε χριομένοις . . . ."

318. "Σὺ γάρ . . . τῷ Πνεύματί σου τῷ ἁγίῳ."

319. "ἁγιάσας . . . δός."

repeated three times just as even the first one and is accompanied by a second blessing of the water by the priest, even though this is not attested to either by the ancient nor by many later codices.[320]

The next question also refers to a related issue.

188

Does the sanctification of the water of Hagiasmos take place through the plunging of the precious cross?

As we wrote in the previous answer, the sanctification of the species of the various mysteries or other "sacramental"[321] rites occurs through the invocation of the Holy Spirit, which is accompanied by a crosswise blessing by the hand of the priest. Nikolaos Kabasilas observes in this regard that "we believe the sanctification of the mysteries [takes place] by the prayer of the priest, relying not on human power, but on that of God. For [it takes place] not on account of the human being who prays, but on account of God who listens, nor because the former prayed but because the Truth promised to give" (*Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 29.7).[322] And Symeōn of Thessaloniki, in summarizing the pertinent tradition and patristic teaching, writes: "We believe that all the divine rites receive consecration by the prayer of the priest in a divine invocation and by the seal of the cross, according to divine tradition" (*Explanation of the Divine Temple*, 88).[323] Especially regarding the services of Hagiasmos, the same one writes: "For Theophany also, we sanctify by prayers the sanctified waters and also the [waters] sanctified according to each [prayer], since the priests possess the power from Him who was bap-

320. The latest editions of the Hieratika of the Apostolikē Diakonia (2019) and the Ecumenical Patriarchate (2020) do not incorporate the recommendation for correction of the copying error.

321. "μυστηριωδῶν." This word can be translated "mysterious," "mystical," "secret," and "with hidden spiritual meaning." The word "sacramental" is used to avoid confusion.

322. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 29.7 (SC 4bis:184–185).

323. Phountoulēs modified the verb from "πιστεύωμεν" (let us believe) to be "πιστεύομεν" (we believe), Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*,146.

tized in water [namely from Christ] when the Spirit descended . . . and brought to completion by the seal of the cross and the invocation of the Holy Spirit" (*Explanation*, 88).[324] Thus, the sanctification of the water during both Hagiasmoi is done consistent with the above through the invocation of the Holy Spirit and the crosswise sealing of the waters by the hand of the priest. Moreover, we wrote regarding the sanctification prayer of the Small Hagiasmos on another occasion in the answer to question 167.

The immersion of the precious cross is done in both cases at the end of the service, when the sanctification of the water has already been completed. In the currently used Euchologia and in certain later manuscripts, the immersion of the cross is introduced by a standard rubric according to which it appears that some consecratory character is attributed to this practice. Namely, the rubric states that the priest, in baptizing[325] the cross, "blesses" or "sanctifies" the waters. We must not understand these words literally. The immersion of the cross in the Small Hagiasmos was introduced from the influence of the Great Hagiasmos, where again it was introduced in a later period, not for the already sanctified water to be sanctified, but for a representation of the Baptism of the Lord to take place in this manner. Precisely "lowering and raising it [the cross] upright," which exists in these rubrics of both Hagiasmoi, is indicative of the attempt for the descent and ascent of Christ in the Jordan to be symbolically represented. This could be easily perceived as an act of sanctification by analogy with the Baptism of the Lord in the Jordan. Given that the streams of the Jordan were sanctified through the descent of the Lord into them, so also the waters—into which the precious cross is baptized in place of the Lord—are themselves sanctified by their contact with the sacred symbol.

---

324. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 138–141 (modified). The bracketed additions are those of Phountoulēs. The first bracketed suggestion ("waters") does not appear to be a sound reading of the text, where Symeōn may be speaking more widely of the invocation of the Holy Spirit than just of the Hagiasmos.

325. "Βαπτίζων" as well as the verb, βαπτίζω (I baptize), are understood here as a dipping action with the precious cross representing the Baptism of the Lord.

However, the fact that the analogy is not absolutely precise we can conclude—aside from the above testimonies of Kabasilas and Symeōn, who clearly speak about the consecration of the waters of Hagiasmoi[326] through the prayer and seal of the priest—also from the taxis itself of the Hagiasmos, the texts of the prayers, the old tradition, and the parallel of the sanctification of the water of holy baptism. In the prayers for the sanctification of waters that exist in ancient Euchologia, such as also in the Euchologion of Serapion, bishop of Thmuis (fourth century), the sanctification of water takes place by the invocation and not by the immersion of the cross. In the prayer for sanctification of the water of holy baptism, again, the sanctification of water takes place in the same manner. After the sanctification prayer, according to ancient witnesses, the priest sprinkled the people with sanctified water. Likewise, also in both the Great and Small Hagiasmos, originally no immersion of the cross took place; again, the water was sanctified through the prayers alone (*Codices Barberini 336, Sinai 956, 957, 958, 961*, and others). Moreover, the present-day services of both the Great and Small Hagiasmos also again after the invocation of the Holy Spirit presuppose the water as now being sanctified. The prayer of inclination that follows ("Incline your ear, O Lord, and hear us . . .")[327] speaks about partaking of the water sanctified by the preceding prayer, "and deem us worthy to be filled with your sanctification by both the partaking and sprinkling of this water and let it become . . .."[328] Moreover, in the most ancient witnesses of our manuscript Euchologia concerning the immersion of the precious cross, the words, "sanctifies"[329] or "blesses"[330] do not exist, which were later added when the original and correct meaning of the immersion of the cross was forgotten, but rather it simply

326. Phountoulēs is using the term, "ἁγιασμῶν," in the sense of any Hagiasmos.

327. "Κλῖνον, Κύριε, τὸ οὖς σου, καὶ ἐπάκουσον ἡμῶν . . ."

328. "καὶ καταξίωσον ἡμᾶς ἐμπλησθῆναι τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ σου διὰ τῆς τοῦ ὕδατος τούτου μεταλήψεώς τε καὶ ῥαντισμοῦ καὶ γενέσθω . . ."

329. "ἁγιάζει."

330. "εὐλογεῖ."

says "puts"[331] (*Codex Athens 670*) or "plunges"[332] (*Vatopediou 324, Sinai 968*) or "immerses"[333] (*Patmos 104* and *690*), or more characteristically "baptizes"[334] (*Athens 713, 788, Lavras 189, Patmos 105, Sinai 974, 981, 991*), and "immerses the precious cross into the holy water"[335] (*Panteleēmonos 364, Patmos 104*).

189

During the plunging of the cross in the water in the Small Hagiasmos, where did the chanting originate of the troparion, "O Lord, save your people . . .,"[336] instead of perhaps the more correct one, "When you were baptized in the Jordan, O Lord"[337]?

In the previous answer, we wrote that the plunging of the precious cross into the water of the Small Hagiasmos came from the service of the Great Hagiasmos of Theophany, where, again, it was introduced in later times as a representation of the Baptism of the Lord. Nowadays, this practice has generally come to prevail for both Hagiasmoi, with the only difference that during the Great Hagiasmos the apolytikion of Theophany is chanted, "When you were baptized in the Jordan, O Lord . . .," while during the Small Hagiasmos, "O Lord, save your people . . ." is chanted. However, in both these Hagiasmoi, before the chanting of these troparia was solidified during the plunging of the cross, the liturgical practice knew many modifications on this point, also another indication of its later origin. For example, in the Great Hagiasmos, the immersion of the cross took place during the exclamation for the prayer of inclination, "For you are our sanctification . . ." (*Codices Athens 670, 2086, Vatican 1292, Patmos 105*). According to another codex, "In the name of the Father . . ." was said by the priest during the baptizing of the cross in imitation of the baptism of the faithful (*Sinai 966*). According to

331. "βάλλει."
332. "ἐμβάπτει."
333. "καταδύει."
334. "βαπτίζει."
335. "καταδύει τὸν τίμιον σταυρὸν ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὕδατι."
336. "Σῶσον Κύριε τὸν λαὸν σου . . ."
337. "Ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ βαπτιζομένου σου, Κύριε . . ."

others, "Glory to the holy, consubstantial, unconfused, undivided, and incomprehensible Trinity . . ."[338] usually three times (*Lavras 189, Panteleēmonos 364, Patmos 104*). Other manuscripts attest to the recitation of "Christ is baptized . . .,"[339] (*Sinai 973*), or "The Father is light . . ."[340] (*Hag. Saba 568*), or "A great cross appeared . . ."[341] (*Kōnstamonitou 60*), or the chanting of "Alleluia" with verses and troparia (*Sinai 974, 991*). After the immersion of the cross, various troparia and, more customarily, the apolytikion of the feast, "When you were baptized in the Jordan, O Lord . . ." were chanted during the sprinkling and sanctification of the people. Most likely, this element was influenced by the taxis of the Paschal vigil, which began with "Glory to the holy . . ."[342] and the apolytikion of the feast, "Christ is risen . . .."[343] This most clearly appears in the manuscript, *Panteleēmonos 364*, according to which "When you were baptized in the Jordan, O Lord . . ." was chanted three times "immediately" after "Glory to the holy . . ." and the immersion of the cross. Gradually, "When you were baptized in the Jordan, O Lord . . .," alone remained to be chanted both during the immersion of the cross and the sprinkling of the people (*Athens 788, S. 724*) and, if the time was not sufficient, it was chanted repeatedly or even other relevant troparia from the hymnology of the feast after it.

We observe precisely the same fluctuation in the tradition also in the Small Hagiasmos. When the custom of the cross's immersion was also transplanted to it, the chanting of the apolytikion for the feast had still not become prevalent in the Hagiasmos of Theophany, and we find in it all the stages of development of this point of the service of the Great Hagiasmos. Thus, we have a baptizing[344] of the cross during the exclamation of the prayer of inclination, "For you are our sanctification . . ." (*Athens 713*), or during the exclamation of

338. "Δόξα τῇ ἁγίᾳ, ὁμοουσίῳ, ἀσυγχύτῳ, ἀδιαιρέτῳ, καὶ ἀλήπτῳ Τριάδι . . ."
339. "Βαπτίζεται ὁ Χριστός . . ."
340. "Φῶς ὁ Πατήρ . . ."
341. "Μέγας σταυρὸς ἐφάνη . . ."
342. "Δόξα τῇ ἁγίᾳ . . ."
343. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη . . ."
344. "βάπτισι" (the spelling in the text). Namely, an immersion.

the sanctification prayer, "For you are the source of healings . . ."[345] (*Sinai 981*), or when "In the name of the Father . . ." is said (*Athens S. 724, Vatopediou 324, Sinai 968*), or "Glory to the holy . . ." (*Vatopediou 324, Kōnstamonitou 60, Panteleēmonos 364, Patmos 690*), or "The Father is light . . ." (*Patmos 690*), or also a combination of two or even more from the above traditions (*Vatopediou 324, Patmos 690, Sinai 968*). Consistent with the form of the Great Hagiasmos, the apolytikion ought to be chanted during the sprinkling. However, what ought to be in the Small Hagiasmos? In any case, not the apolytikion for the feast of Theophany, because the Small Hagiasmos is never performed on Theophany, nor even performed in remembrance of the Baptism of the Lord. We wrote about this in the answer to question thirty-seven, which referred to the form for the dismissal of the Small Hagiasmos. Two other troparia laid claim to this place; the hymn for the Mother of God, "Of your gifts . . .,"[346] and the apolytikion for the cross, "O Lord, save your people . . .." In the manuscripts, one encounters sometimes the first, "Of your gifts . . .," (*Athens 661, 662, 664, 670, 1910, S. 690, Vatopediou 324, Panteleēmonos 364, Patmos 690, Sinai 968, 981*) and other times the second, "O Lord, save your people . . ." (*Athens 669, 672, 674, 759, 798, 887, S. 64, S. 573, Paris Coislin 213, Kōnstamonitou 60, Patmos 105*) or even both of them together (*T. Staurou 615*). When what happened in the Small Hagiasmos also happened in the Great Hagiasmos and the immersion of the cross finally was also done with the chanting of the apolytikion, then the chanting of one of the two became prevalent also here, or even the compromise solution of chanting both, just as is also done in the present-day practice, according to the printed editions.

To the question which naturally arises for us, why these two troparia were preferred and not others, the answer can be given from the content of the whole service of the Small Hagiasmos, from the time when it is celebrated, and from its historical development. We

345. "Ὅτι σὺ εἶ ἡ πηγὴ τῶν ἰαμάτων . . ."

346. "Τῶν σῶν δωρεῶν . . ." The full text of the hymn is: "Τῶν σῶν δωρεῶν ἀξίους ἡμᾶς ποίησον, Θεοτόκε Παρθένε, παρορῶσα τὰ πλημμελήματα ἡμῶν, καὶ παρέχουσα ἰάματα, τοῖς ἐν πίστει λαμβάνουσι τὴν εὐλογίαν σου, Ἄχραντε."

must place the preference for the theotokion, "Of your gifts . . .," within the service's entire content belonging to the Mother of God. The Small Hagiasmos has a series of theotokia/troparia and is essentially placed within a service of supplication to the Panagia. The service was likely developed in a temple dedicated to the Theotokos, which was found in Constantinople, and perhaps in the temple of Blachernai. Many troparia make mention of the "temple" and the "city" of the Theotokos. In certain manuscripts, a blessing even precedes for an entrance of a temple that was founded in her honor ("Blessed is the entrance of your holies through the Theotokos who bore you, O Christ our God . . .,"[347] *Codices Lavras 21, Sinai 980*). Indeed, in the *Codex Megistēs Lavras 189*, the service is entitled, "Service of sanctification at every beginning of the month and on the feast of the most holy Theotokos,"[348] or in the *Codex Patmos 105*, "Service of the Hagiasmos during the month of August,"[349] namely, the month of the Theotokos.

On the other hand, we must explain the chanting of the apolytikion of the Precious Cross, "O Lord, save your people . . .," as being probably due to the celebration of the Small Hagiasmos on August 1, namely, the feast of the Procession of the Precious Cross, during which the procession was performed in connection with the service of the Small Hagiasmos and the chanting of the apolytikion of the day, "O Lord, save your people . . ." (*Patmos 105, T. Staurou 40*). The "baptizing of the precious wood" that was done on August 1 perhaps also itself influenced, parallel to the baptizing of the cross during the Great Hagiasmos, the introduction of the immersion of the cross into the Small Hagiasmos as well. Perhaps a second reason is the celebration of this service in the "sacred palace" of the Byzantine emperors on the first day of each month in the presence of the emperors. As is well known, this troparion contains a petition for the emperors ("grant victory to the emperors over the barbar-

347. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ εἴσοδος τῶν ἁγίων σου διὰ τῆς τεκούσης σε Θεοτόκου, Χριστὲ ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν . . ." For the translation of "holies," see questions 170 and 600.

348. "Ἀκολουθία τοῦ ἁγιάσματος κατὰ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν μηνὸς καὶ εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν τῆς ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου."

349. "Ἀκολουθία τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ κατὰ τὸν μῆνα Αὔγουστον."

ians"),[350] and for this reason it is also included in the trisagion for the emperor at the beginning of the service of Matins. Moreover, in the sanctification prayer of the Small Hagiasmos, as well as in the Great Hagiasmos, there is a special petition for the emperors ("and preserve [or, save], O Lord, your servants our faithful emperors") indeed repeated three times, which was originally said only in the palace when the emperor was present ("when the patriarch might bless the waters in the palace, he also adds this to the present prayer, 'And save, O Lord . . .,'" *Codex Sinai 957*).[351]

190

Out of necessity, is the priest able to celebrate the Divine Liturgy without a chanter and sexton[352]?

Question fifty addressed the first part of this question, as to whether the priest is able to celebrate the Divine Liturgy without a chanter. At the time, we examined the subject at length. We summarize that the presence of the people is a necessary condition for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, even if they are represented by only one individual. The chanter represents the people in his dialogue with the priest and replies on behalf of the people and chants whatever troparia belong to the people, inasmuch as the people are not able to or, by custom, they themselves are not willing to assume the role that belongs to them in the Divine Liturgy. The ideal is for the Divine Liturgy to be always celebrated with the presence of a person capable of chanting the various liturgical pieces so that its celebration is commensurate with its sanctity and worthy of the glorified God. However, if need be, especially in private Liturgies, when the finding of a suitable person is not possible, the priest must guide those present to respond or recite, even in the simplest manner, in the form of reading, whatever is provided to be chanted by the peo-

350. "νίκας τοῖς βασιλεῦσι κατὰ βαρβάρων . . ."

351. For related discussions, see questions 212 (end of the answer), 225, 256, 396 (where there is a brief reference regarding imperial polychronismoi), 417, and 588.

352. "νεωκόρου."

ple.[353] Certain more difficult melodies, such as the cheroubikon and "It is truly meet,"[354] can be chanted by the priest after the reading of the prayers or can even simply be read by the faithful.

Regarding the second part of the question, again the same things apply. Certainly, also here, the ideal is for there to be a certain suitable and experienced person to serve in the holy bēma during the celebration of the Divine Liturgy—the sexton—so that the priest celebrates the mystery without distraction. However, in the absence of this, the Divine Liturgy can be celebrated with the assistance of any other person who, being suitably guided by the priest, will prepare the censer, the zeon, and the antidōron for him, and will hold the censer and the candle during the entrances. And in those cases where male individuals are not present to serve in the bēma, again the priest can seek the help of the women present for things outside of the bēma, such as the preparation of the zeon, the censer, the candle-bearing, and so forth, as also takes place in women's monasteries. The priest by himself will attempt to complete all the rest.

In any event, even in the case of a lack of a chanter and sexton, when the priest will be partly compelled to also perform their duties, it must not be forgotten that his own work is to offer the sacrifice and to preside at the altar. This obligates him to distance himself from this as little as possible and not be distracted by other tasks of a secondary importance.

353. In the Church of Greece, so-called "private Liturgies" are celebrated in small chapels on private lands or those belonging to parishes and monasteries. These Liturgies are celebrated on the basis of *ad hoc* requests from the faithful, often out of affinity or spiritual obligation to the saint for whom the chapel is dedicated. Although these *ad hoc* Liturgies are technically open to others, they are not part of the official parish calendar nor even made known to other congregants. The phrase "we opened the church" (ἀνοίξαμε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν) is an expression often heard in villages after a family has arranged and provided for the celebration of such a Liturgy, especially in the case of chapels not normally used.

354. "Ἄξιόν ἐστιν."

191

At the beginning of the catechesis, why do we seal the face of the one about to be illumined while saying, "In the name of the Father . . ."?[355]

192

Why, while each service begins with "Blessed is our God . . ." and the trisagion, does the service of catechesis immediately begin with the prayer, "In your name, O Lord . . ."[356]?

We wrote regarding the second question in answer to questions ninety and ninety-one. The prayer "for the making of a catechumen"[357] and the exorcisms, the renunciation, the joining, and the confession of faith that follow do not constitute a particular church service, but rather are independent prebaptismal practices, which took place in the ancient church separately from holy baptism in various special preparatory synaxes for the catechumens. After the prevalence of infant baptism, they lost their original importance and were brought together before holy baptism in the place where they are found nowadays. After the fourteenth century, an attempt was made to include them within the framework of a standard service, for which reason we find in certain manuscripts of this period the usual form for the enarxis of services preceding, namely, "Blessed is our God . . .," sometimes also the trisagion, and more rarely some troparia relevant to baptism, such as those of Theophany, of the Forerunner, and so forth (*Codices Athens 664, 665, 669, 696*). The attempt was also not lacking for this "service" to be concluded with a dismissal (*Athens 851*). However, fortunately, both the manuscripts

355. The word "seal" (σφραγίς) and associated terms can refer to the sign of the cross traced on a person or to an anointing. In this case, the verb "σφραγίζω" (I seal) is referring to the "signing" or tracing of the form of the cross and not an anointment. For a brief discussion of this use, see Byron David Stuhlman, *The Initiatory Process in the Byzantine Tradition, Texts in Translation from Early Manuscripts of the Euchology and Typikon of the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, with a brief commentary*, Gorgias Eastern Christian Studies 18 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2009), 17.

356. "Ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου, Κύριε . . ."

357. "εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι κατηχούμενον."

and printed editions, at least most of them, remained faithful to the correct ancient form of this group of prebaptismal rites, where neither a "Blessed,"[358] trisagion, troparia, nor a dismissal are required, because it is not even a service as we understand it nowadays.

"In the name of the Father . . .," and the sealing of the face of the catechumen that accompanies it, is not an element of the enarxis of the service, analogous to the ones preceding, but is the old original sealing that was given to the catechumens before the reading of the prayer by which they were placed into the ranks of the catechumens. This is attested to by the manuscripts and the Fathers of the Church. The codices preface the prayer "for the making of a catechumen" with the rubric, "[the priest] seals his forehead [of the catechumen] and the mouth and the breast" (*Barberini 336, Athens 662, 670, 685, 1910, 2086*), or "he seals his forehead to the breast three times while making three crosses with his hand" (*Sinai 968*), or "he seals his forehead to the breast three times" (*Athens 573, 667*), or "he seals the child" (*Athens 665*). The sacred Chrysostomos, Dionysios the Areopagite, and other ancient Fathers of the East and the West speak regarding this seal. Symeōn of Thessaloniki also interprets the meaning of this sealing, "[the priest] again sealing three times by hand with this sign of the cross on account of 'Your hands have made me and fashioned me,' also on the forehead . . . on account of the intellect and on the mouth on account of speech and on the heart on account of the vital principle . . ." (*Dialogue*, chapter 62).[359] The seal was also accompanied by an invocation of the Holy Trinity, just as it is known to us from other instances and just as it is clearly attested to by the *Codex Athens S. 724*, "and he seals him on the forehead and on the mouth and on the breast while saying, 'In the name of the Father . . ..'"

193

During the time when they dress the child, the priest reads the prayers that follow. Is "As many of you that have been

358. "εὐλογητό."
359. PG 155:213d.

baptized into Christ . . ."[360] subsequently chanted followed by the epistle reading, the gospel reading, the ektenēs, and the relevant dismissal, or must we follow taxis of the Euchologia?

We also wrote on this topic in the answer to question eighty-seven. The manuscripts and printed Euchologia contain the taxis for the service of holy baptism as it was formed during the period when infant baptism was not widespread. Moreover, the entire present-day service of baptism is comprised of many independent rites that took place on different days before and after the baptism. These two reasons contributed to this service undergoing in practice certain adaptations, traces of which we find in both the manuscripts and in Symeōn of Thessaloniki. And while the ancient form of the service exists in our current liturgical books, no one any longer performs what is prescribed there in this manner, because new conditions and the intervening development of the service led to a liturgical impasse.

Specifically, at the end of the service to which the question refers, most of the priests follow the sequence that is described in the question. They read the prayers during the time that they dress the baby and the katabasies are chanted. Some priests defer only the third prayer of washing, "He/She that has put on you, O Christ . . .,"[361] and others also the second prayer of tonsure, "O Lord our God, who through the fullness of the font . . .,"[362] which they read either immediately after the return of the baby upon its complete dressing and before "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ . . ." or after the ektenēs and before the dismissal.

Given that the service of baptism in our Euchologia has not been officially set in order, there does not exist another solution than for the relevant local tradition in question to be followed.

360. "Ὅσοι εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε . . ."
361. "Ὁ ἐνδυσάμενος (ἡ ἐνδυσαμένη) σε . . ."
362. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος τῆς κολυμβήθρας . . ."

194

In certain places, during the service of betrothal and marriage, the rings and crowns are placed according to the rubric of the Euchologion on the holy table and the priest reads the prayers from the beautiful gate. In other places, a folding stand or a table is placed in the middle of the temple and the Gospel book, the rings, the crowns, and the common cup are placed on it. What is more correct? In the second case, where must the priest stand, between the beautiful gate and the table or between the future spouses and the table?

The celebration of the service of betrothal and marriage presents a significant number of variations by location, which are due to a variety of reasons, especially the preservation of older liturgical practices or the introduction of local customs and other traditions into it. The same and even greater variation is observed in the manuscript tradition. One is rarely able to encounter agreement not only in the manuscripts of various eras, which are bound to differ according to this service's course of historical development, but also in manuscripts of the same period.

Specifically, these differences to which the questioner refers are due to the removal of the present-day form of the service of marriage from its original context, namely, the Divine Liturgy. It is well known that the two services of betrothal and of crowning were celebrated organically interwoven with it and the entire rite culminated with the communion of the newlyweds. Betrothals were performed separately from the marriage, again, within the Divine Liturgy. Namely, in this case of the celebration of the betrothal alone, the ones about to be betrothed "presented themselves before the holy gates" or "before the gates of the sanctuary," and upon the holy table "on the right side," the rings were found, as well as the Presanctified Gifts if there was not going to be a complete Liturgy celebrated. The priest stood at the beautiful gate before the ones being betrothed, recited the prayers, and afterwards celebrated the Divine Liturgy or communed them from the Presanctified Elements. Again, in the service of marriage, the position of the future spouses and the priest was the

same; the crowns, the common cup, and the Presanctified Gifts (if the complete Liturgy was not celebrated) were found on the holy table. However, if the betrothal and the marriage were celebrated at the same time, a practice which for various reasons eventually became prevalent, while the betrothal was celebrated in the narthēx, the marriage was celebrated before the beautiful gate united with the Divine Liturgy. Then for the first time there appears in the service of betrothal the "portable stand"[363] (*Sinai 966*) or the "suitable four-legged portable table"[364] (*Athens 829*) or the folding stand[365] that was placed in the narthēx or in the diakonikon (*Athens 668*) or even in a house where the betrothal was about to be performed. On this table was placed whatever also was on the holy table, namely, the Gospel book and the rings. After the service of betrothal, the entrance took place into the temple and the service of marriage was celebrated before the beautiful gate, just as also when the marriage was celebrated independently from the betrothal.

Gradually for various reasons, which now is not the time for us to present, the service of crowning was detached from the Divine Liturgy, whether the complete Liturgy or the Presanctified. However, the service continued to be celebrated just as previously, before the beautiful gate; the priest stood between it and the altar, on which no longer were placed the Presanctified Elements, but only the crowns and the common cup. This intermediate practice is still observed in certain places. However, eventually, perhaps in imitation of the betrothal, the service of marriage was also detached from the altar and was celebrated in the middle of the temple near a "small table,"[366] where the betrothal was now celebrated, and on it was placed everything necessary for both rites, namely apart from the Gospel book, the rings, the crowns, and the common cup. The holy table was no longer used, because the mystery of marriage ceased to be associated with holy communion. The priests stood between the small table and the newlyweds, as originally between them and the

363. "μετειππίδιον."
364. "ηὐπρεπισμένον τετράποδον."
365. "δισκέλιον."
366. "τραπέζιον."

holy table, or, if the space was not sufficient, behind it, namely, between it and the beautiful gate in the manner that the priests stood in the ancient church, namely, behind the altar. Matters as regards this point are immaterial.

While we did not examine whether rightly or wrongly the service of betrothal and marriage was detached from the Divine Liturgy, natural development also leads to the abandonment of the altar. The rubric of the Euchologion appears anachronistic.

195

I heard during the service of Matins of Great Week, "Let us complete our morning prayer to the Lord"[367] corrected to "Let us complete our evening prayer . . ."[368] and "The whole day perfect . . ."[369] to "The whole evening . . .."[370] Likewise, also during the service of Vespers (of the Presanctified) "Let us complete our evening prayer . . ." corrected to "Let us complete our morning prayer . . ." and "The whole evening . . ." to "The whole day . . .." Is it right for these corrections to be done?

This correction is done by some during the services of Vespers for the days of Great Week, which are performed, as is well known, in the morning, and during the services of Matins for these days, which are performed in the evening. They also do the same thing in Great Lent during the Vespers and Liturgies of the Presanctified, which again are celebrated in the morning.

The reason that they cite for justifying the correction is at first glance quite serious. Namely, how can we logically speak about "evening" prayer and request from God that we pass "the whole evening, perfect, holy," and so forth, while it is still morning, and how can we conversely speak about "day" and about "morning" prayer in the evening? The one who would place in doubt the logical nature of the above argument would be outside the boundaries of natural reality.

---

367. "Πληρώσωμεν τὴν ἑωθινὴν δέησιν ἡμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ."
368. "Πληρώσωμεν τὴν ἑσπερινὴν δέησιν ἡμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ."
369. "Τὴν ἡμέραν πᾶσαν, τελείαν . . ."
370. "Τὴν ἑσπέραν πᾶσαν . . ."

However, permit me to characterize this action as like the tactic of an ostrich or like the effort of someone to hide, as the saying goes, behind his finger. Namely, while in reality a serious problem exists, its handling is done in a completely inadequate, and, let us admit it, ludicrous manner. The problem in our case is self-evident. The ecclesiastical services are inseparably tied to certain stations of prayer, which correspond to certain hours of the day or of the night. The purpose of the Fathers who established these services was strictly the sanctification of these times. Each service has such content in order to constitute the prayer of the Church that takes place in the morning, noon, evening, or at midnight, and so forth. Outside of this natural framework, the services of these times cease to have meaning. This is clearer in our personal prayer. Namely, it would be inconceivable for us to get up in the morning and instead of thanking God for the new day, requesting him to bless our work, and praying that we pass through the work time that we have before us without sin according to his will, that we call upon him to grant us a peaceful sleep, not disturbed by dreams, and without scandal during the night. Thus, the development of the services of the daily cycle started when personal prayer at the various stations of the day and night took a liturgical form and became a public prayer of the Christian community. The service of the Midnight Office was meant to be celebrated in the middle of the night, Matins in the morning, the First Hour around 7:00 a.m., the Third Hour at the time of the descent of the Holy Spirit, namely, at 9:00 a.m., the Sixth Hour at the time of the crucifixion, at 12:00 noon, the Ninth Hour at 3:00 p.m., at the time of the Lord's death, Vespers in the evening, and Compline before reposing. However, the entire system of these services is monastic. As an indispensable presupposition regarding its observance, the system has the monastic brotherhood, which has as its chief—many times also its only—work the glorification of God, the work of angels that left the cares of life and worldly occupations and chose the work of Mary, who while seated at Christ's feet "listened to his teaching."[371] People in the world do not have either the

371. Luke 10:39.

disposition or the possibility to practice this perfect ideal of prayer. Neither is the temple next to their houses in order for them to find themselves day and night in it, nor can they abandon their work to run to church almost every three hours, nor, much more, can they come to the temple during nighttime services. When after the iconoclastic controversy, the system of monastic services began to be transferred to the parishes, the problem of their adaptation to the new, special conditions of the life of the lay members of the Church was felt. Thus, aside from the shortening of the services (for example, in the monasteries, Matins lasts more than three hours, while in parishes hardly exceeds a single hour), either many of the services of the monks were omitted, such as the services of the Hours, Midnight Office, and Compline, or they were performed, but concentrated into two groups, the morning and the evening, which is when the faithful could come to the temple. This naturally caused damage to the services, specifically in relation to their attachment with the time with which they were originally associated. This became even more pronounced during Lent, when almost the whole system of monastic services was preserved. In order for the service of Great Compline to be preserved, Vespers was transferred to the morning, since indeed it was connected on certain days with the Liturgy of the Presanctified, and it was especially difficult for the faithful to fast all day in order to receive communion in the evening. During Great Week, Matins was transferred to the evening and thus a full reversal of the natural framework of the services came about, namely, Matins to be performed at the hour of Vespers or a little later and Vespers at the hour of Matins. And in the monasteries, despite the special way of life of the fathers, for analogous reasons there was again a transfer—but a relevant one—of the services. Thus, the Midnight Office begins a little after midnight so that Matins was connected to it, the Third and Sixth Hours are performed together nearly at the hour that was originally appointed for the performance of the Third Hour, the Ninth Hour with Vespers, and the Liturgy of the Presanctified a few hours earlier than the hour "around the setting of the sun," according to which originally it ought to be performed.

The fact that in the parishes we follow a strange and unnatural approach, despite all good intentions, can be doubted by no one. It would not be possible to doubt as well that the restoration of these things to their correct and original place nearly approaches the limits of the impossible under present-day circumstances. Is this contradiction corrected with the change of "evening" (ἑσπέραν)[372] and "evening" (ἑσπερινήν)[373] to "day" (ἡμέραν) and "morning" (ἑωθινήν) and vice versa? Quite the opposite! On the contrary, apart from the issue of whether or not this change is permitted, the problem remains the same and indeed, a false sense of its solution is created, which causes us to stop seeking a correct and serious handling of it. So what if we change these two words? The service of Vespers is by its very nature an evening service, just as also the service of Matins is a morning one. Would we not say in Vespers, "the sun knows its setting; You established darkness, and it became night,"[374] or "let my prayer be set forth as incense before you, the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice,"[375] or "having come to the setting of the sun and beholding the evening light,"[376] or "vouchsafe, O Lord, this evening . . .,"[377] or "the rest of this present day,"[378] or "who have made us turn aside from every evil during that part of the present day which is now over, grant us also to complete what remains without blame,"[379] or "and to offer you our evening doxology . . . Grant us that the present evening and the coming night may be peaceful, clothe us with weapons of light, deliver us from every night-time fear and from every deed that walks in darkness. And give us sleep . . . freed from every fantasy of the devil . . . may we also be filled with compunction on our beds and call to mind your name in the night . . .

372. Noun.

373. Adjective.

374. Psalm 103:19–20, "ὁ ἥλιος ἔγνω τὴν δύσιν αὐτοῦ. Ἔθου σκότος, καὶ ἐγένετο νύξ."

375. Psalm 140:2, "Κατευθυνθήτω ἡ προσευχή μου ὡς θυμίαμα ἐνώπιόν σου, ἔπαρσις τῶν χειρῶν μου θυσία ἑσπερινή."

376. "ἐλθόντες ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλίου δύσιν, ἰδόντες φῶς ἑσπερινόν."

377. "Καταξίωσον, Κύριε, ἐν τῇ ἑσπέρᾳ ταύτῃ."

378. "τὸ λοιπὸν τῆς παρούσης ἡμέρας."

379. "ὁ ποιήσας ἡμᾶς καὶ τῆς νῦν ἡμέρας τὸ παρελθὸν μέρος ἀπὸ παντὸς ἐκκλῖναι κακοῦ, δώρησαι ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ ὑπόλοιπον ἀμέμπτως ἐκτελέσαι."

that we may rise toward doxology,"[380] or "during the present evening and the approaching night"[381]? And in the service of Matins shall we omit "I laid down and slept, I awoke,"[382] or "early I approach you . . . in the early morning I would meditate on you,"[383] or "Make me to hear your mercy in the morning,"[384] or "Out of the night our spirit rises early to you,"[385] or "Glory be to you who showed the light . . . Vouchsafe, O Lord, this day,"[386] or "who has raised us from our beds,"[387] or "grant to us the sun of righteousness,"[388] or "who let light shine out of darkness, who has given us rest by the sleep of the night and raised us . . . show us forth as sons of light and of the day,"[389] or "accept the morning prayers of us all . . . remember, O Lord, those who keep vigil,"[390] or "for you have given us rest in the part of the night which has passed and raised us from our beds and placed us here,"[391] or "who has raised us up from our beds and gathered us together,"[392] or "who has driven from us the sloth of sleep . . . that we may meet the beginnings of the day,"[393] or "for you

380. "καὶ τὴν ἑσπερινήν σοι δοξολογίαν προσαγαγεῖν . . . Παράσχου δὲ ἡμῖν τὴν παροῦσαν ἑσπέραν καὶ τὴν ἐπιοῦσαν νύκτα εἰρηνικήν· ἔνδυσον ἡμᾶς ὅπλα φωτός· ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ φόβου νυκτερινοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ παντὸς πράγματος ἐν σκότει διαπορευομένου· καὶ δὸς ἡμῖν τὸν ὕπνον . . . πάσης διαβολικῆς φαντασίας ἀπηλλαγμένον . . . ἵνα, καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς κοίταις ἡμῶν κατανυγόμενοι, μνημονεύωμεν ἐν νυκτὶ τοῦ ὀνόματός σου . . . διανιστῶμεν πρὸς δοξολογίαν."

381. "κατὰ τὴν παροῦσαν ἑσπέραν καὶ τὴν προσιοῦσαν νύκτα."

382. Psalm 3:6, "Ἐγὼ δὲ ἐκοιμήθην καὶ ὕπνωσα· ἐξηγέρθην."

383. Psalm 62:2, 7, "πρὸς σὲ ὀρθρίζω . . . ἐν τοῖς ὄρθροις ἐμελέτων εἰς σέ."

384. Psalm 142:8, "Ἄκουστόν ποίησόν μοι τὸ πρωΐ τὸ ἔλεός σου."

385. Isaiah 26:9, "Ἐκ νυκτὸς ὀρθρίζει τὸ πνεῦμα ἡμῶν . . . ."

386. "Δόξα σοι τῷ δείξαντι τὸ φῶς . . . Καταξίωσον, Κύριε, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ."

387. "τῷ ἐξαναστήσαντι ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῶν κοιτῶν ἡμῶν."

388. "χάρισαι ἡμῖν τὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἥλιον."

389. "ὁ εἰπὼν ἐκ σκότους φῶς λάμψαι, ὁ ἀναπαύσας ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ τῆς νυκτὸς ὕπνῳ καὶ διαναστήσας . . . ἀνάδειξον ἡμᾶς υἱοὺς φωτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας."

390. "πρόσδεξαι πάντων ἡμῶν τὰς ἐωθινὰς δεήσεις . . . Μνήσθητι, Κύριε, τῶν ἀγρυπνούντων."

391. "ὅτι διανέπαυσας ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ παρελθόντι τῆς νυκτὸς μέτρῳ καὶ ἐξήγειρας ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῶν κοιτῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἔστησας."

392. "ὁ ἐξαναστήσας ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῶν κοιτῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἐπισυναγαγών."

393. "ὁ τὴν τοῦ ὕπνου ῥᾳθυμίαν ἀποστήσας ἀφ' ἡμῶν . . . καταντῆσαι εἰς τὰς ἀρχὰς τῆς ἡμέρας."

have turned aside the shades of night and shown us again the light of day . . . shine in our hearts the true sun of righteousness"[394]?

With all the above, I think that the seriousness of the issue became clear. Its treatment must also be proportionate to it. Either, namely, when weighing the reasons that caused the transfer of the services, we find them so serious that we recognize as necessary and unavoidable this harm that takes place, in which case we shall offer to the whole body of our Church a correct service of Matins or Vespers at reversed hours, or at least that we do not find the transfer correct, and then we must fundamentally address the issue and not naively believe that when changing two words we turned the morning service into an evening one, and the evening service into a morning one.

196

The phrase, "by the grace of the all-holy and life-receiving tomb"[395] is added by some to the prayer, "Save, O God, your people and bless your inheritance, visit . . .,"[396] after the words, "by the power of the precious and life-giving cross."[397] Where did this phrase come from?

The addition of the phrase "by the grace of the all-holy and life-receiving tomb," to the prayer, "Save, O God, your people . . ." as well as to the dismissals, at least as far as I know, is not encountered in any manuscript or printed liturgical book. It is done by some clergy influenced by the liturgical practice of the Church of Jerusalem, where, as we know, the tomb of the Lord has always been and is one of the central objects of veneration. The patriarchs of Jerusalem invoke the grace and blessing of the all-holy tomb in their various writings. The liturgical practice of the Church of Jerusalem always influenced the worship of the local churches. However, this point to which the question refers clearly has a local character and is not

394. ὅτι παρήγαγες τὴν σκιὰν τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ ἔδειξας ἡμῖν πάλιν τὸ φῶς τῆς ἡμέρας . . . λάμψον ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν τὸν ἀληθινὸν ἥλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης."

395. "τῇ χάριτι τοῦ παναγίου καὶ ζωοδόχου τάφου."

396. "Σῶσον, ὁ Θεὸς, τὸν λαόν σου καὶ εὐλόγησον τὴν κληρονομίαν σου, ἐπίσκεψαι . . ."

397. "δυνάμει τοῦ τιμίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ."

justified except only in the Church of Jerusalem and its dependencies. The prayer, "Save, O God, your people . . .," and the dismissals are sufficiently weighed down with invocations for intercessions of many saints, and their increased growth with the addition of unnecessary elements would not be desirable.

197

During the celebration of the mystery of holy baptism, it is customary for the midwife to take part (she holds the child until the questions and answers and assists during the dressing). By the latter action, she of necessity touches the sanctified water, oil, and holy myron. Due to the nature of the midwife's profession in comparison with the sacredness of the mystery, is the above permitted?[398]

It is well known that in older societies the midwife enjoyed special honor. Her collaboration in childbirth, in the entry into the world of a new human being, was considered a labor preeminently sacred and respected. Nowadays in urban societies, matters have quite changed, but from the accounts of the elderly, we know that even up until the days of our parents, the midwife together with the priest and the teacher were considered as the three preeminently respected persons of our villages.

This presupposition explains the liturgical, so to speak, character of the midwife, which mainly emerges in various pre-baptismal services. Thus, the prayers "for a woman in childbed"[399] nearly always mention the midwife and "the attending women"[400] for the birth of the child. For example, in the third prayer of present-day printed edition, there is a supplication for the "ones who have touched"[401] the woman in childbed and those who were found at the time of

398. At the time of this writing, the Greek medical system did not extend to many rural areas of the country. Midwives occupied an important position in many villages and even took a role in hospitals and medical facilities where they existed. The school for their training in Greece continues to exist.

399. "εἰς γυναῖκα λεχώ."

400. "τὰς παρατυχούσας γυναῖκας."

401. "ἁψαμένους."

the birth in the home of the woman in childbed. In various codices, there are other prayers that expressly speak about "the women in labor and the midwives"[402] (*Codex Athens 829*), or about those who have gathered and served during the parturition (*Athens 664, S. 724*), but even other special prayers "for the midwife"[403] (*Megistēs Lavras 21, P. Taphou 8 [182]*[404]), or "for the attending women"[405] (*Athens 669, 1910*), or "for women who are found at the hour of birth"[406] (*P. Taphou 8 [182]*). These prayers chiefly seek the blessing, the sanctification, and the purification of the midwife and of the other women who served at the birth, from "the pollution of the body and the stain of the soul" in order that they are deemed worthy "blamelessly and purely to enter the holy church and to partake of the divine mysteries." A basis of these prayers is the very ancient viewpoint concerning purity and impurity, which in a later period entered also into Christian worship through the influence of the applicable legislation of Leviticus. One of these prayers refers to the blessing of the midwives of the Hebrews who kept alive the newborn males in Egypt (Exodus 1:15–21; *Codex P. Taphou 8 [182]*) and another prayer refers to the vision of the apostle Peter in Joppa (Acts 10: 9–16) and to the words of the apostle Paul, "to the pure all things are pure" (Titus 1:15, Romans 14:20; *Codex Athens 1910*). This last prayer places the subject on a firm theological foundation.

The midwife does not only serve during the delivery and does not only receive the first prayers together with the mother and the newborn. The midwife also brings the baby into the temple "to receive a name" on the eighth day after birth. The role of the midwife in this instance is attested to by the manuscripts (*Athens 662, 664, S. 64, P. Taphou 8 [182]*, and so forth) and the printed editions. In *P. Taphou 8 [182]*, it appears that even on the fortieth day, perhaps when the mother was prevented, again the midwife brought the

402. "τὰς κοπιαζούσας γυναῖκας καὶ τὰς μαίας."
403. "τῆς μαίας."
404. The full name for this codex is "*Metochiou tou Panagiou Taphou Kōnstantinoupoleōs 8 (182).*" Throughout his work, Phountoulēs abbreviates this reference. However, in question 278, he cites the full title.
405. "εἰς τὰς παρατυχούσας γυναῖκας."
406. "εἰς τὰς εὑρεθείσας γυναῖκας τῇ ὥρᾳ τῆς γεννήσεως."

child in her arms and after the pertinent prayers and the churching of the baby she received it back again.

But even during baptism, in certain codices, it appears that again the midwife serves. Thus, the *Codex Athens 664* notes: "if [the catechumen] is a baby, the midwife holds it in her arms, standing towards the east, outside of the church [in order for the exorcisms to be read]" and *Athens 829* records that the baby "is held by the midwife" during the prayers of exorcism. According to other manuscripts, the baby is held by the sponsor.

The anointing by the oil of exorcism was usually done "by the deacon" (*Sinai 959, 962, 973, Vatopediou 324*), or "by the deacons" (*Sinai 971*), or "by the deacon or servant"[407] (Sinai 968) or "by the sponsor" (*Sinai 966*). However, there exist manuscripts which attest that the anointing was done by the midwife, such as the codices, *Metochiou tou Panagiou Taphou Kōnstantinoupoleōs 8 [182]* ("it is anointed by the midwife or by the deacon") and *T. Staurou 68* ("the whole body is anointed by the midwife . . . then [the priest] takes up the child from the midwife and baptizes it").[408]

The dressing of the newly illumined was originally done, as it seems, by the priest alone. Namely, what normally takes place nowadays with the putting on of the baptismal garments on the baby, at that time had a real significance; the priest dressed the newly illumined with the chitōn, koukoulion, the belt, and the "other clothing" and said a special prayer for each one. In some manuscripts, the sponsor is also present to assist with the dressing by himself/herself or to dress the child with the assistance also of other persons. According to the *Codex Sinai 988*, after the baptism, the baby

407. "ὑπὸ τοῦ διακόνου ἢ ὑπηρέτου." The "servant" (ὑπηρέτης) is a member of a minor order, such as a subdeacon.

408. A printing error resulted in a confusion of the cited manuscripts that is corrected here in the translation. In the case of the first, based on the citation "8 (182)," the reference was corrected from *T. Staurou Kōnstantioupoleōs* to *Metochiou tou Panagiou Taphou Kōnstantinoupoleōs 8 (182)*. The second reference "68" now reads "*T. Staurou 68*," based on the same reference later in the question. However, in question 465, Phountoulēs cites "*Hagiot. Metochiou 68.*" Based on this, the title of this codex might be, "*Metochiou tou Panagiou Taphou Kōnstantinoupoleōs 68*" and the references made in the present question could be printing errors. Further research is necessary to resolve this issue.

was swaddled by the midwife ("the midwife takes and swaddles it"). In any case, a rubric that is found in the *Codex Athens 669* directs the attention of the priest to the sacredness of the water of baptism and forbids the sponsor and the midwife to touch it ("but neither the sponsor nor the midwife may dare to approach the holy baptismal font because it is a great sanctification. The priest alone immerses the child").[409] The *Codex T. Staurou 68* notes nearly the same thing.

The midwife no longer appears except at the end of the service; at that time, the priest orders her and the mother "not to soak[410] the newly illumined nor to wash its face for seven days, but on the eighth day let them wash and bathe it" (*Codex Athens 669*).

Therefore, from this retrospection into the old practice, it is shown that the work of the midwife was not considered incompatible with the sacredness of the mystery of baptism; on the contrary, it was considered as a type of sacred ministry that is not exhausted in the services that she will offer during the delivery, but also extended to the sacred rites that accompany the entrance of the new human being into the Church. For this reason, also, before, during, and after baptism, the midwife is the person immediately after the mother and the sponsor. What has been forgotten in the cities, due to the change of living conditions, is still preserved in part among our village communities, more modest and more faithful to tradition, in which by divine grace, the questioner also serves.

409. The verb used is, "κολυμβᾷ," which in Modern Greek would be used for "swimming," but in the sixteenth century usage means an immersion, whether in the font or for bathing in general.

410. "κολυμβήσωσι."

198

In the resurrectional apolytikion for the plagal of the second tone, "When the angelic powers appeared on your grave,"[411] I heard that instead of "you went to meet the virgin" (ὑπήντησας τῇ παρθένῳ) it is more correct for us to say, "you went to meet death" (ὑπήντησας τῷ θανάτῳ). Must this correction be made?

This has to do with an unfortunate correction that has a long history. In 1911, the former archbishop of Cephalonia, Spyridōn Kompothekras, in a series of articles that he published in the periodical, *Ἱερὸς Σύνδεσμος*, under the general title, "Liturgics," included also a study with the subtitle, "A historical and logical error, 'You went to meet death while granting life' and not 'You went to meet the Virgin while granting life'" (May 15, 1911 issue, pp. 1–6).[412] There, he proposed the above correction and cited for its justification the historical and philological arguments below: First, that the Mary of the troparion, namely, Mary Magdalēnē, "from the narratives in the gospels was not a virgin. Therefore, 'virgin' is unable to refer to her because the gospel account rejects it. Consequently, the phrase, 'you went to meet the virgin,' is historically mistaken." Second, the hymnographers frequently use the figure of contrast. Contrast here calls for the word, "death" (θανάτῳ) and not "virgin" (παρθένῳ); there exists no contrast between the word, "virgin," and the word, "life," while by the correction, "contrast so customary and beloved by sacred hymnographers also takes place, in other words, the gift of spiritual and eternal life by the death of the Savior." Third, the phrase as it exists in the troparion, according to the former Archbishop of Cephalonia, does not have any meaning, while "'you went to meet death' makes clear that you oppose or face death 'when granting life.'" Finally, fourth, he also cites a doctrinal reason, "You went to

411. "Ἀγγελικαὶ δυνάμεις ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμά σου . . ."

412. Σπυρίδων Κομποθέκρας, "Λειτουργικά, Λάθος ἱστορικὸν ἅμα καὶ λογικόν. Ὑπήντησας τῷ θανάτῳ δωρούμενος τὴν ζωὴν καὶ ὄχι ὑπήντησας τῇ παρθένῳ δωρούμενος τὴν ζωήν," *Ἱερὸς Σύνδεσμος*, May 15, 1911, 1–6. Spyridōn Kompothekras (1835–1914), although consecrated as archbishop of Cephalonia, he later resigned from his see after being condemned for simony, *MEE*, 24:793. *Ἱερὸς Σύνδεσμος* was a weekly ecclesiastical periodical of the Metropolis of Athens published by its clergy association (1894–1922).

198

In the resurrectional apolytikion for the plagal of the second tone, "When the angelic powers appeared on your grave,"[411] I heard that instead of "you went to meet the virgin" (ὑπήντησας τῇ παρθένῳ) it is more correct for us to say, "you went to meet death" (ὑπήντησας τῷ θανάτῳ). Must this correction be made?

This has to do with an unfortunate correction that has a long history. In 1911, the former archbishop of Cephalonia, Spyridōn Kompothekras, in a series of articles that he published in the periodical, *Ἱερὸς Σύνδεσμος*, under the general title, "Liturgics," included also a study with the subtitle, "A historical and logical error, 'You went to meet death while granting life' and not 'You went to meet the Virgin while granting life'" (May 15, 1911 issue, pp. 1–6).[412] There, he proposed the above correction and cited for its justification the historical and philological arguments below: First, that the Mary of the troparion, namely, Mary Magdalēnē, "from the narratives in the gospels was not a virgin. Therefore, 'virgin' is unable to refer to her because the gospel account rejects it. Consequently, the phrase, 'you went to meet the virgin,' is historically mistaken." Second, the hymnographers frequently use the figure of contrast. Contrast here calls for the word, "death" (θανάτῳ) and not "virgin" (παρθένῳ); there exists no contrast between the word, "virgin," and the word, "life," while by the correction, "contrast so customary and beloved by sacred hymnographers also takes place, in other words, the gift of spiritual and eternal life by the death of the Savior." Third, the phrase as it exists in the troparion, according to the former Archbishop of Cephalonia, does not have any meaning, while "'you went to meet death' makes clear that you oppose or face death 'when granting life.'" Finally, fourth, he also cites a doctrinal reason, "You went to

411. "Ἀγγελικαὶ δυνάμεις ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμά σου . . ."

412. Σπυρίδων Κομποθέκρας, "Λειτουργικά, Λάθος ἱστορικὸν ἅμα καὶ λογικόν. Ὑπήντησας τῷ θανάτῳ δωρούμενος τὴν ζωὴν καὶ ὄχι ὑπήντησας τῇ παρθένῳ δωρούμενος τὴν ζωήν," *Ἱερὸς Σύνδεσμος*, May 15, 1911, 1–6. Spyridōn Kompothekras (1835–1914), although consecrated as archbishop of Cephalonia, he later resigned from his see after being condemned for simony, *MEE*, 24:793. *Ἱερὸς Σύνδεσμος* was a weekly ecclesiastical periodical of the Metropolis of Athens published by its clergy association (1894–1922).

meet death while granting life" agrees "in the most complete manner with the foundations of Christian dogma according to which the death of Jesus was the atoning sacrifice to God on behalf of humankind . . . The death of the Savior was the source of our spiritual and eternal life."

Objections verbally, as it seems, were formulated to this proposal of the former Archbishop of Cephalonia, because in the June 1st issue of the same periodical (p. 3) he returns to the topic and, confusing Mary Magdalēnē with the sinful woman who anointed the Lord with ointment before his passion, cites a collection of phrases from the troparia of Great Wednesday where Mary Magdalēnē according to him is explicitly called a "prostitute" (πόρνη) and a "sinner" (ἁμαρτωλός) and never a "virgin" (παρθένος). Two foreign periodicals, *Roma e l'Oriente* (vol. 2, 1911, pp. 246ff) and *Échos d'Orient* (vol. 15, 1912, pp. 300ff) commented favorably on these articles and the corrections of the former Archbishop of Cephalonia.[413] The points regarding Magdalēnē were otherwise consistent with the relevant tradition that is prevalent in the Western church. Indeed, in a publication of the Slavonic Hōrologion that was done in 1938 in Rome by the Uniates, the troparion was published with the correction that Spyridōn proposed. In reaction to the article of the first foreign periodical that we mentioned, the former Archbishop of Cephalonia returned to the topic and published the judgments and comments of this periodical on pages 4–6 of the October 1, 1911, issue of *Ἱερὸς Σύνδεσμος*. However, in the same issue (p. 14), the editorship of the periodical made its position distinct and reserved the right to formulate its opinions and observations. Professor K. Dyovouniōtēs was the editor, who in fact wrote two brief articles in the same periodical (November 1, 1911 issue, p. 12 and December 1, 1911 issue, pp. 11–12), in which he rejected the correction of Spyridōn, because it was not supported in the manuscripts, in which every similar endeavor must be based.[414] However, in the debate that opened in this manner, the

413. *Roma e l'Oriente* 2 (1911): 246ff. *Échos d'Orient* 15 (1912): 300ff.

414. *Ἱερὸς Σύνδεσμος*, November 1, 1911, 12, December 1, 1911, 11–2. Kōnstantinos Dyovouniōtēs (Κωνσταντῖνος Δυοβουνιώτης) (1872–1943) was a graduate of the Rizareios Ecclesiastical School and the Theological School

then archimandrite Chrysostomos Papadopoulos mainly took part, who in a series of articles demonstrated that the tradition of our Church considers Mary Magdalēnē a virgin, a point with which the gospel narrative agrees, or at the very least, does not contradict (*Ἱερὸς Σύνδεσμος*, November 1, 1911, pp. 4–5; December 1, 1911, pp. 5–7; and March 15, 1912, pp. 8–9).[415] Spyridōn also responded to both, strongly maintaining his positions (November 15, 1911, pp. 4–7; February 1, 1912, pp. 9–12; March 1, 1912, pp. 11–13; and April 1, 1912, pp. 9–10).[416] The debate closed without either Dyovouniōtēs or Papadopoulos convincing Spyridōn, nor Spyridōn persuading those objecting.

The only one who understood the correct meaning of the troparion was Saint Nektarios (Kephalas), who, in his letter to the former Archbishop of Cephalonia, supports the traditional wording, "you went to meet the virgin" (ὑπήντησας τῇ παρθένῳ).[417] According

of Athens, who pursued advanced studies at the Universities of Leipzig and Halle, eventually teaching at the Rizareios School as a professor (1915–1938) and becoming general editor of *Ἱερὸς Σύνδεσμος* (the weekly ecclesiastical periodical of clergy association in the Metropolis of Athens) from 1905–1916. He also held various posts and teaching positions at the Theological School of the University of Athens, where he taught dogma, ultimately becoming dean of that institution. He was an extremely active scholar with a large number of publications in his field of dogmatics, (Ν. Καρμίρης, "Δυοβουνιώτης, Κωνσταντῖνος," *ΘΗΕ* 5:233-238).

415. *Ἱερὸς Σύνδεσμος*, November 1, 1911, 4–5, December 1, 1911, 5–7, March 15, 1912, 8–9. Chrysostomos Papadopoulos (Χρυσόστομος Παπαδόπουλος) (1868–1938) was Archbishop of Athens and All Greece (1923–1938), previously being a professor of general church history at the University of Athens (1914–1923). He was educated at the Seminary of Constantinople, the Theological School of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem, the Evangelical School of Smyrna, the Theological School of the University of Athens, and the Theological Academies of Kiev and Saint Petersburg. He was responsible for major changes within the Church of Greece, including the adoption of the reformed Julian Calendar. The majority of his scholarly publications were concentrated in church history (Ἰω. Χ. Κωνσταντινίδης, "Χρυσόστομος," *ΘΗΕ* 12:417-420).

416. *Ἱερὸς Σύνδεσμος*, February 1, 1912, 9–12, March 1, 1912, 11–13, April 1, 1912, 9–10

417. Saint Nektarios (Kephalas) (Ἅγιος Νεκτάριος [Ὁ Κεφαλᾶς]), (1846–1920) was recognized as a Saint by the Ecumenical Patriarchate and Church of Greece in 1961. He was a graduate of the Theological School of the University of Athens and emigrated to Alexandria, where he was eventually consecrated

to Saint Nektarios, the "virgin" is none other than the Theotokos, who according to patristic interpretation, first saw the risen Lord. Likewise, he also rejected the view of Spyridōn that Mary Magdalēnē was not a virgin. The letter of Saint Nektarios has also been published in the recently printed book by Fr. Theodōrētos, a monk of the Holy Mountain, *Saint Nektarios: The Hierarch, Man of Words, Ascetic*, Athens 1970, pp. 80–84.[418] But "another man of words" also verbally demonstrated to the former Archbishop of Cephalonia that "virgin/παρθένῳ" as it is governed with the article, "the/τῇ," must most certainly mean the Theotokos. This objection gave him a pretext to come back with a series of arguments and persistently support the correction that he proposed. The new arguments were that if Christ appeared to the Panagia, this would be expressly mentioned in the gospels, that the troparion would not say "you went to meet the virgin" (ὑπήντησας τῇ παρθένῳ) but rather "you were born from a virgin" (ἐτέχθης ἐκ παρθένου), that the Theotokos is mentioned only in theotokia and not in resurrectional apolytikia, and finally, that "you went to meet the virgin" is parallel with the preceding phrase, "and Mary stood," who, according to Spyridōn, is Mary Magdalēnē, (*Ἱερὸς Σύνδεσμος*, June 1, 1912, pp. 9–10).[419]Also, again, he returned to supporting his proposal dogmatically, when claiming that Christ gave life not through his encounter with the virgin, but with his victory over death (July 1, 1912 issue, pp. 8–9).[420] So much for the history of this correction.

The foundation on which the former Archbishop of Cephalonia relied was mistaken from the start. Texts are not corrected through arbitrary theories or theological biases. The first task in such cases

---

Metropolitan of Pentapolis. After leaving Egypt, he returned to Greece and became director of the Rizareios Ecclesiastical School from 1894–1908, eventually retiring to Holy Trinity Convent on the island of Aegina, where he remained until his repose. His large output of writings included works of theological and spiritual content as well as moral-religious studies, (Βαρνάβας, Ὁ Μητροπολίτης Κίτρους καὶ Κατερίνης, [Τζωρτζάτος], "Νεκτάριος," *ΘΗΕ* 9:397-399).

418. Θεοδώρητος, Μοναχὸς Ἁγιορείτης, *Ὁ Ἅγιος Νεκτάριος: ὁ ἱεράρχης, ὁ λόγιος, ὁ ἀσκητής* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1970), 80–84.

419. *Ἱερὸς Σύνδεσμος*, June 1, 1912, 9–10.

420. *Ἱερὸς Σύνδεσμος*, July 1, 1912, 8–9.

is for us to research the manuscript tradition whether this is about a copying error or any correction. Only in this way will we be able to ascertain what our author originally wrote here. In our case, the testimonies of the manuscripts are so clear and indisputable that there remains no doubt, that the original wording is "the virgin" (τῇ παρθένῳ) and not anything else, since only this one is attested to by all the codices. The second step will be for us to attempt to understand what precisely the hymnographer wishes to tell us and not for us to present our own point of view as his own. We are interpreters and not authors of the troparion. At this point also again, the former Archbishop of Cephalonia missed the mark and became a cause to carry away the entire discussion on an erroneous path. In the first place, there must be no doubt that the author of the troparion would characterize Saint Mary Magdalēnē with the word, "virgin." The unanimous tradition of the East, which the hymnographer also follows without fail, clearly attributes this characteristic to Magdalēnē and expressly distinguishes her from the homonymous Mary, the sister of Lazarus, and the sinful women who anointed the Lord with myrrh, the one at the house of Simon and the other "a short time before the passion."[421] Chrysostomos Papadopoulos proved this, despite the objections of Spyridōn. K. Dyovouniōtēs also formulated the same view concerning the myrrhbearer in his article with the title, "Mary Magdalēnē," which he published as a direct reply to the former Archbishop of Cephalonia, in *Ἱερὸς Σύνδεσμος* of February 15, 1914, pp. 3–8.[422] The hymnographers of Magdalēnē speak about the "seven demons" by which she was possessed before being cured by Christ, and repeatedly call her, with the adjective, "modest" (σεμνή) but never "prostitute" (πόρνη) or "sinner" (ἁμαρτωλό) a thing that they do not hesitate to do for other repentant sinful women. However, is the "virgin" of our troparion Mary Magdalēnē?

421. "μικρὸν πρὸ τοῦ πάθους." Most likely, Phountoulēs is referring to the synaxarion for Matins of Great Wednesday where a similar phrase is used: "Τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ μεγάλῃ Τετάρτῃ, τῆς ἀλειψάσης τὸν Κύριον μύρῳ πόρνης γυναικός, μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι οἱ θειότατοι Πατέρες ἐθέσπισαν, ὅτι πρὸ τοῦ σωτηρίου Πάθους μικρὸν τοῦτο γέγονε."

422. *Ἱερὸς Σύνδεσμος*, February 15, 1914, 3–8.

The author of the troparion is inspired by the relevant narratives of the evangelists concerning the visit of the myrrhbearing women to the tomb and the appearance of the Risen One on the morning of the Sunday of Pascha. This is especially based on the narrative of the evangelist Matthew, which is contained in the twenty-eighth chapter of his gospel, verses 1–10. We quote the relevant phrases of the Gospel and the corresponding ones of the troparion in parentheses:

Ἦλθε Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία θεωρῆσαι τὸν τάφον [καὶ ἵστατο Μαρία ἐν τῷ τάφῳ] . . . ἄγγελος γὰρ Κυρίου, καταβὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, προσελθὼν ἀπεκύλισε τὸν λίθον ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας καὶ ἐκάθητο ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ [ἀγγελικαὶ δυνάμεις ἐπὶ τὸ μνῆμά σου] . . . ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ φόβου αὐτοῦ ἐσείσθησαν οἱ τηροῦντες καὶ ἐγένοντο ὡσεὶ νεκροὶ [καὶ οἱ φυλάσσοντες ἀπενεκρώθησαν] . . . Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον ζητεῖτε [ζητοῦσα τὸ ἄχραντόν σου σῶμα] . . . καὶ ἰδοὺ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπήντησεν αὐταῖς λέγων· χαίρετε [ὑπήντησας τῇ παρθένῳ δωρούμενος τὴν ζωήν].

Mary Magdalēnē and the other Mary went to see the tomb [and Mary stood at the tomb] . . . for an angel of the Lord, having descended from heaven, approaching rolled away the stone from the entrance and sat upon it [When the angelic powers appeared on your grave] . . . from fear of him the guards trembled and became as dead men [and those guarding became as dead] . . . 'you seek Jesus who was crucified' [seeking your undefiled body] . . . and behold, Jesus met[423] them saying, 'Hail' [you went to meet[424] the virgin while granting life].

Instead of "ἀπήντησεν" (met) of the ecclesiastical text,[425] the oldest manuscripts have "ὑπήντησεν" (went to meet); the hymnographer also had in mind this reading. The dependence of the troparion on the above evangelical narrative is obvious.

The ecclesiastical hermeneutical tradition on "the other Mary" of Matthew, or on the "Mary of Jacob" of Mark and Luke, always saw the virgin as Mary, the Theotokos. All the interpreters and ecclesiastical authors who dealt with this subject, either because they follow an old ecclesiastical tradition, or from emotional reasons,

423. "ἀπήντησεν."
424. "ὑπήντησας."
425. Phountoulēs is referring to the text of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, *Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη ἐγκρίσει τῆς Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1912), 80.

when basing themselves on the above passages clearly teach that the first appearance of the Lord after the Resurrection could not have been made to anyone other than to His Mother. She with Magdalēnē came to the tomb seeking the body of Christ in order to weep and to anoint it with myrrh; and the Theotokos first heard the gospel of the Resurrection, saw the Risen One, and "seized" His feet. The Latin poet Sedulius, Tatian, Grēgorios of Nyssa, Chrysostomos, Sevēros of Antioch, Eusebios of Alexandria, Geōrgios of Nikomedia, Anastasios of Sinai, Symeōn Metaphrastēs, Grēgorios Palamas, and others agree on this. Indeed, the latter one also has an entire homily on the Sunday of the Myrrhbearers in which he speaks at length "that the Theotokos first saw the Lord risen from the dead."[426]

Ecclesiastical hymnography is also based on the same tradition. Rōmanos the Melodist[427] puts into the mouth of the Lord, "Take courage, O Mother, because you see me first from the tomb."[428] Theophanēs in the second troparion in the first tone of the canon for the Theotokos, which is chanted on the Sunday of the Myrrhbearers, refers to the same theme: "Beholding your Son and God risen, you also rejoice with the apostles, O Pure one full of divine grace . . .."[429] The troparion of Pascha also elaborates the same poetic tradition, "The angel cried aloud to her who is full of grace: Hail, O pure Virgin; and again, I say Hail. Your Son is risen from the tomb on the third day."[430] The synaxarion for the Sunday of

426. Grēgorios Palamas, *Homily 18* in Παναγιώτης Χρήστου, ed. and trans., *Γρηγορίου τοῦ Παλαμᾶ Ἅπαντα τὰ ἔργα 9, Ὁμιλίες (Α'– Κ')*, Ἕλληνες Πατέρες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας 72 (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατερικαὶ Ἐκδόσεις «Γρήγοριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς,» 1985), 518. See the translation in Christopher Veniamin, trans., *Saint Gregory Palamas: The Homilies* (Dalton, PA: Mount Thabor Publishing, 2016), 144.

427. Rōmanos the Melodist (Ῥωμανὸς ὁ Μελωδός), sixth century hymnographer and saint. For an extensive discussion of this major hymnographer, see José Grosdidier de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de la poésie religieuse à Byzance* (Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1977).

428. "Θάρσει, μῆτερ, ὅτι πρώτη με ὁρᾷς ἀπὸ τοῦ τάφου."

429. "Ἀναστάντα κατιδοῦσα σὸν Υἱὸν καὶ Θεὸν καὶ χαίροις σὺν ἀποστόλοις, θεοχαρίτωτε ἁγνή . . ."

430. "Ὁ ἄγγελος ἐβόα τῇ κεχαριτωμένῃ· Ἁγνὴ παρθένε, χαῖρε καὶ πάλιν ἐρῶ χαῖρε, ὁ σὸς Υἱὸς ἀνέστη τριήμερος ἐκ τάφου."

Pascha written by Nikēphoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos[431] also precisely recounts the same things ("And first the Resurrection becomes known to the Mother of God, when sitting opposite the tomb as Matthew says, with Magdalēnē")[432] as well as the Synaxarion for the commemoration of Saint Mary Magdalēnē ("And at the same time she first [Magdalēnē] beheld the other Mary, the most holy Theotokos, late in the Sabbath she saw the angel").[433] For this reason, also in Christian iconography, the Theotokos is depicted together with the myrrhbearers, either hearing the gospel of the Resurrection from the angel or embracing Christ or grasping his feet.

Therefore, the author of the troparion, "When the angelic powers appeared on your grave . . .," when he speaks regarding "Mary" and the "virgin," he means the same person, the Virgin Mary, the Theotokos, who according to the tradition that we saw above was one of the myrrhbearers and came to the tomb seeking the body and encountered first the Risen One. Therefore, the correction, "you went to meet death" (ὑπήντησας τῷ θανάτῳ) is unjustified both paleographically and historically. As for the contrast, which perhaps would be more emphatic and theological if the word "death" (τῷ θανάτῳ) was used, we cannot attribute it to the author of the troparion. However, also again, no one can discern it in the correct traditional text: To Mary, the Virgin, who full of sadness and mourning stood at the tomb and sought your dead body, you the one resurrected from the dead came and bestowed life.

---

431. Nikēphoros Xanthopoulos (d. ca. 1335) was a priest of Saint Sophia, made significant contributions to hymnology, the interpretation of liturgical texts, as well as the composition of prayers and synaxaria, and wrote a church history, the surviving text of which extends to the seventh century. See Hans-Georg Beck, *Kirche und Theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959), 705–706.

432. "Καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ἡ ἀνάστασις τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ Μητρὶ γνώριμος γίνεται, ἀπ' ἐναντίας καθημένῃ τοῦ τάφου, ὡς φησὶν ὁ Ματθαῖος, σὺν τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ."

433. "Καὶ πρώτη [ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ] ἅμα τῇ ἄλλῃ Μαρίᾳ, τῇ ὑπεραγίᾳ Θεοτόκῳ, κατεῖδεν ἡνίκα ὀψὲ Σαββάτων εἶδε τὸν ἄγγελον." Phountoulēs appears to be acknowledging that there are two ecclesiastical traditions, one holding that the Virgin Mary first sees the risen Christ and the other that both the Virgin and Magdalēnē first see the risen Christ. In either case, this does not negate the tradition that the Theotokos first sees the risen Christ.

199

In the Cherubic hymn,[434] the Slavs chant, "πᾶσαν νῦν βιοτικήν"[435] but we chant, "πᾶσαν τὴν βιοτικήν."[436] Which is the more correct?

200

I have read in a manuscript, "Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέροντες κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα" (Your own of your own, offering to you in all and for all). In the printed texts, it has, "σοὶ προσφέρομεν" (we offer to you), as we also say nowadays. Which of the two is the correct one?

In the preceding question 198, we saw an instance of an attempted wrong correction of a liturgical text that fortunately did not find acceptance in the printed editions of our liturgical books. In the case of these two questions, we have precisely the opposite; two mistaken readings that have penetrated our liturgical books and ended up being considered correct through their continual repetition. The writer will attempt to show what is correct in both these cases, even though he is not very optimistic concerning the practical outcome of this attempt. There is not a worse and more permanent affair than errors grown old,[437] especially in matters of worship. Let us not forget that similar mistakes, such as "For the world from above"

---

434. The full text of the Cherubic hymn is the following:

Οἱ τὰ Χερουβὶμ μυστικῶς εἰκονίζοντες, καὶ τῇ ζωοποιῷ Τριάδι τὸν τρισάγιον ὕμνον προσᾴδοντες, πᾶσαν [νῦν] βιοτικὴν ἀποθώμεθα μέριμναν. Ὡς τὸν βασιλέα τῶν ὅλων ὑποδεξόμενοι, ταῖς ἀγγελικαῖς ἀοράτως δορυφορούμενον τάξεσιν. Ἀλληλούϊα. Ἀλληλούϊα. Ἀλληλούϊα.

Let us who mystically represent the Cherubim and who sing the thrice-holy hymn to the life-creating Trinity, let us [now] lay aside every earthly care. That we may receive the king of all, invisibly escorted by the angelic hosts. Alleluia. Alleluia. Alleluia.

The question concerns whether the word "νῦν" (now) in brackets above must be sung in the hymn.

435. "πᾶσαν νῦν βιοτικήν [ἀποθώμεθα μέριμναν]" ([let us] now [lay aside] every earthly [care]).

436. "πᾶσαν τὴν βιοτικήν [ἀποθώμεθα μέριμναν]" ([let us lay aside] every earthly [care]).

437. "πεπαλαιωμένες πλάνες."

instead of "For the peace from above," became causes of strife and schism, even in lands of the same faith (for example, the Old Believer schism in Russia).

Let us begin with the Cherubic hymn. And first from the manuscripts. All the old codices have the reading, "πᾶσαν νῦν βιοτικήν" ([let us] now [lay aside] every earthly [care]). This can easily be verified, and it is not required that we enumerate the codices. Seventeen manuscripts from the Monastery of Ivērōn of the Holy Mountain alone attest in favor of this reading. Their catalogue is at the disposal of every scholar. Commensurate numbers of esteemed manuscripts from also other libraries can demonstrate, without a margin for the slightest doubt remaining, that the original reading at this point of the hymn is "now" (νῦν) and not "the" (τήν). The ancient translations also come to our aid on this. We find the adverb of time, "now" (νῦν), in all the Liturgies that resulted from the translation of the Byzantine Greek Liturgies, such as in Slavonic (nyně/нынѣ), Romanian (acum), and Arabic (alana/الآن). Thus, this is chanted in the Liturgy even nowadays by these peoples.

As is well known, parallel hymns that are chanted in place of the cheroubikon at the time of the great entrance are: "Νῦν αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν . . ." (Now the powers of heavens . . .) of the Presanctified, "Τοῦ δείπνου σου τοῦ μυστικοῦ . . ." (Of your mystical supper . . .) of Great Thursday, and "Σιγησάτω πᾶσα σὰρξ βροτεία . . ." (Let all mortal flesh keep silent . . .) of Great Saturday. In the first two of these, there is the corresponding adverb to which particular emphasis is given, "Νῦν αἱ δυνάμεις . . . (Now the powers . . .), "σήμερον, Υἱὲ Θεοῦ . . ." (today, O Son of God . . .). There are also analogous expressions in prayers that are said at the time of the Cherubic hymn, such as in the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos ("ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ ὥρα ταύτῃ," in this holy moment)[438] and in the second prayer of the faithful from the Liturgy of the Presanctified before the entrance of the precious gifts, "ἰδοὺ γὰρ τὸ ἄχραντον αὐτοῦ σῶμα καὶ τὸ τίμιον αἷμα

438. "ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ ὥρα ταύτῃ." B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 68.

κατὰ τὴν παροῦσαν ὥραν εἰσπορευόμενα" (for behold, His Immaculate Body and Precious Blood which are entering at the present time").

It is therefore apparent that the intention of the hymn's author is to emphasize the special sacredness of this moment during which the people of God are about to receive, when suitably prepared, the "king of all."[439] Moreover, the phrase, "πᾶσαν νῦν βιοτικὴν ἀποθώμεθα μέριμναν" (let us now lay aside every earthly care), is the center of the hymn, which carries the whole weight of its content. The verb is also found there upon which both participles before and after are dependent. And to use the interpretation of Professor P. Trempelas (*Leitourgikon*, Athens 1963, pp. 73–75),[440] the meaning of the hymn must be the following: "We who (before the earthly divine altar) symbolize (and represent) mystically (and without being perceptible by bodily eyes) the Cherubim and sing (along with them) to the life-giving Trinity the thrice-holy hymn (Holy, holy, holy Lord of Sabaoth), let us put aside every earthly care at these moments, because we (are about to) receive the king of all, the one who is invisibly accompanied (with power and honor) by the angelic ranks."

Finally, we passed over the grammatical position of the article, "τήν" (the), or the adverb, "νῦν" (now), in the contested phrase; and this is because the norms of classical grammar are not always applied by our hymnographers. From a proficient handler of the ancient language, in which the hymn is written, the article would never come before, "βιοτικὴν μέριμναν" (earthly care). He would write it without the article, "πᾶσαν βιοτικὴν μέριμναν" (every earthly care). It is then also grammatically apparent that only the adverb of time, "νῦν" (now), because the king is coming, is the only word that would fit into the structure of the phrase. However, "νῦν/nēn" (now), almost identically sounding like "τήν/tēn" (the), yet more difficult than τήν/tēn for chanters with little education,[441] at some

439. "βασιλέα τῶν ὅλων."

440. Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Λειτουργικόν* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἀδελφότης θεολόγων "Ὁ Σωτήρ," 1963), 73–75.

441. In Modern Greek, the word for "now" is "τώρα" and not "νῦν" as in the ancient language. Phountoulēs is pointing out that uneducated Greek chanters prefer to substitute a word they know and use, "τήν," which still means "the" in the modern language and sounds like "νῦν."

point gave up its place for the easier and more familiar τήν/tēn.[442] Let us hope that this mistake will not remain uncorrected "νῦν καὶ ἀεί" (now and ever).[443]

Something analogous also transpires with "σοι προσφέρομεν" (we offer to you), which replaced the correct, "σοι προσφέροντες" (offering to you),[444] with the difference that this must have taken place in a somewhat older period than the previous case because the later form, "σοι προσφέρομεν" (we offer to you), exists in the Slavonic, Romanian, Arabic, and Armenian translations.

And again, all the old and many later manuscripts have the original and correct form, "σοι προσφέροντες" (offering to you). Out of the nearly ninety manuscripts in the National Library of Athens and the Byzantine Museum that Professor P. Trempelas was aware of, during the critical edition of the three Byzantine Liturgies (*The Three*

442. Author's footnote: The hieromonk Elder Athanasios of Ivērōn of blessed memory supported the correct reading with sacred passion. In the Monastery of Ivērōn, the corrected hymn, "νῦν βιοτικήν" (now earthly), is chanted. Translator's note: The same correction is contained in the *Συλλειτουργικόν* published by the Monastery of Simōnopetra on the Holy Mountain (2014), p. 150. In addition, the same liturgical book makes the other correction recommended below from "σοι προσφέρομεν" (we offer to you) to "σοι προσφέροντες" (offering to you) (p. 154). This appears to reflect a trend to follow the recommendations of Phountoulēs. The 2005 edition of the Ἐγκόλπιον Ἀναγνώστου καὶ Ψάλτου of the Apostolikē Diakonia makes an identical correction to "νῦν βιοτικήν" (p. 187) but did not make the other change to "σοι προσφέροντες" (p. 191). The 2009 edition of the Hieratikon of the Apostolikē Diakonia acknowledges the more correct reading recommended by Phountoulēs (pp. 132, 343 §5), but nevertheless continues the mistaken text on account of its age-old use and the contention that no current harm is done to the syntax or meaning of the prayer. One consideration in making such changes in the future might also be the effects of the continued use of older Byzantine notation chant books that may have such errors embedded.

443. The author employs "νῦν" (now) when citing the often-repeated phrase from the liturgical exclamation, "νῦν καὶ ἀεί" (now and ever) and in this way implies the hope that the erroneous reading will not be used forever.

444. The word, "προσφέρομεν," is a first-person plural indicative active verb. The word, "προσφέροντες," is a plural present active masculine nominative participle.

Liturgies According to the Codices in Athens, Athens 1935),[445] more than seventy have the reading, "προσφέροντες" (offering), instead of "προσφέρομεν" (we offer). The same ratio also exists among the manuscripts of other libraries. The same phrase is also encountered with small variations in the Alexandrian Liturgy of Saint Grēgorios the Theologian: "Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν δώρων σοὶ προσφέροντες κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσι" (Your own of your gifts offering to you according to all and for all and in all).[446]

However, apart from paleographic reasons, which attest without any doubt that the old correct reading is "προσφέροντες" (offering), also reasons of the internal nature of the anaphora prayer, to which the phrase belongs, necessitate the reading in question to be correct. The prayer begins with a dialogue of priest and people and continues up until its end to maintain this dialogue form. Not only what is said by the priest but also the replies of the people constitute inseparable portions of the whole and the one presupposes the other. Thus, "Ἄνω σχῶμεν τὰς καρδίας" (Let us lift up our hearts) is connected with "Ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον" (We lift them up to the Lord) and "Εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ Κυρίῳ" (Let us give thanks to the Lord) with "Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον" (It is proper and right) and this again with the beginning of the prayer, "Ἄξιον καὶ δίκαιον σὲ ὑμνεῖν . . ." (It is proper and right to hymn you . . .). The triumphal hymn, "Ἅγιος, ἅγιος,

445. Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας*, Texte und Forschungen zur Byzantinisch–Neugriechischen Philologie no. 15 (Ἀθῆναι: Ἡ ἐπιστημονικὴ ἐπιτροπὴ πρὸς ἀναθεώρησιν καὶ ἔκδοσιν τῶν λειτουργικῶν βιβλίων, 1935).

446. The text of the Liturgy based on PG 36:699–734 is published in Γρηγόριος Μοναχὸς Ἁγιορείτης, ed., *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Πατρὸς ἡμῶν Γρηγορίου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Θεολόγου* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἱερὰ Μονὴ Πεντέλης, 1971) and *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις Πατρὸς ἡμῶν Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἱ. Μητρ. Θεσσαλονίκης, 1981). See the edition of Phountoulēs, "Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου. Εἰσαγωγικὰ προβλήματα," in *Χρονικὰ Συνεδρίων: Μνήμη ἁγίων Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου καὶ Μεγάλου Φωτίου ἀρχιεπισκόπων Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. Συμπόσιο τοῦ Κέντρου Βυζαντινῶν Ἐρευνῶν, Θεσσαλονίκη 14-17 Ὀκτωβρίου 1993* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἀριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης, 1994). For a discussion of this Liturgy and basic secondary references for the anaphora, see Παναγιώτης Ἰ. Σκαλτσῆς, "Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ ἁγίου Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου," *Ὁ Ἐφημέριος* 61 (2012): 7–10.

ἅγιος . . ." (Holy, holy, holy . . .), which is said by the people, constitutes a continuation of the prayer, "βοῶντα, κεκραγότα, καὶ λέγοντα" (exclaiming, proclaiming, and saying), but also presupposes the continuation of the prayer, "Μετὰ τούτων καὶ ἡμεῖς τῶν μακαρίων δυνάμεων . . ." (Together with these blessed powers, Master who loves humankind, we also . . .). The Liturgy of Basileios the Great is constructed in precisely the same manner, as well as all the anaphoras of the various Liturgies of all liturgical forms. This is precisely what the sacred Chrysostomos says, "The priest prays for the people, and the people pray for the priest . . . Again, the elements of the Eucharist are common; for neither does he give thanks alone, but also all the people. For having first received their utterance, next when they add that it happens worthily and rightly, then he begins the Eucharist" (*Homily 18 on 2 Corinthians*).[447] In precisely this connection with what precedes and follows in the prayer is found:

Μεμνημένοι τοίνυν . . . Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέροντες κατὰ πάντα καὶ διὰ πάντα . . . Σὲ ὑμνοῦμεν, σὲ εὐλογοῦμεν . . . Ἔτι προσφέρομέν σοι . . .	Remembering, therefore . . . Your own of your own, offering to you, in all and for all . . . We praise you; we bless you . . . Once again, we offer to you . . .

The participle, "σοι προσφέροντες" (offering to you), has its apodosis,[448] "σὲ ὑμνοῦμεν . . ." (we hymn you . . .), where also the verb is. Otherwise, "σὲ ὑμνοῦμεν . . ." (we hymn you . . .) presents itself as completely unrelated to the context of the prayer, while in contrast, not only is what precedes dependent on it, but with this phrase what follows is also connected, " . . .καὶ δεόμεθά σου, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν. Ἔτι προσφέρομέν σοι . . . καὶ δεόμεθα καὶ ἱκετεύομεν . . ." (. . .and we pray to you, our God. Once again, we offer to you . . . and pray and entreat you . . ."). In the Alexandrian Liturgy of Basileios the Great, the connection with what follows is more characteristic, where the phrase, "Σὲ ὑμνοῦμεν" (We hymn you . . .), is shared between priest and people:

447. Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos, *Homily 18.3 on 2 Corinthians*, PG 61:527.

448. Here grammatically, an "apodosis" is the main (consequent) clause of a conditional sentence.

Ὁ λαὸς λέγει· 'Σὲ αἰνοῦμεν, σὲ εὐλογοῦμεν'. Ὁ ἱερεὺς λέγει ἐν ἑαυτῷ· 'Καὶ δεόμεθα καὶ παρακαλοῦμέν σε, φιλάνθρωπε . . .'

The people say, 'We praise you, we bless you.'
The priest says to himself, 'And we pray, and we beseech you, O Lover of humankind . . .'

The correction of the original and correct "σοι προσφέροντες" (offering to you) to "σοι προσφέρομεν" (we offer to you) was done, as it appears, in a period where it had become prevalent for prayers to be said inaudibly and the exclamations of the priests and the responses of the people began to lose their meaning, since when isolated from the prayers, they did not have by themselves, independently from their context, any autonomous meaning. Thus, from ignorance of the context, they suffered corrections and revisions in a manner where an independent existence would be ensured for them. We have exactly the same case in the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos. The prayer of the anaphora concludes in a dialogue,

[ὁ ἱερεὺς:] . . .'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὁ μόνος ἀναμάρτητος φανεὶς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, [ἐκφώνως:] δι' ὃν καὶ ἡμῖν καὶ αὐτοῖς, ὡς ἀγαθὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος δεσπότης,
[ὁ λαός:] ἄνες, ἄφες, συγχώρησον, ὁ Θεός, τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν, τὰ ἑκούσια, τὰ ἀκούσια, τὰ ἐν γνώσει, τὰ ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ,
[ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐκφώνως:] χάριτι καὶ οἰκτιρμοῖς καὶ φιλανθρωπία . . .

[the priest:] . . .of Jesus Christ, for he is the only sinless one appearing on the earth [in an exclamatory manner:] through whom [δι' ὃν] both for us and for them, as a good Master who loves humankind,
[the people:] remit, forgive, pardon, O God, our transgressions voluntary, involuntary, in knowledge, in ignorance,
[the priest, in an exclamatory manner:] by the grace and compassion and love for humankind . . .."

This is about a continuous phrase, which for the same reasons that we encountered in the Byzantine Liturgies, was not considered as unified out of misunderstanding. Then also, "δι' ὃν" (through whom) was corrected to "δι' ὧν" (through which) and finally to "δός" (grant). Thus, all the phrases acquired independence, just as "Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν σοὶ προσφέρομεν" (Your own of your own we offer to you . . .) and "Σὲ ὑμνοῦμεν . . ." (We hymn you . . .) of our Liturgies.

201

Can two siblings of a different gender be baptized in one single baptismal font and in the same sanctified water?

This question refers to the well-known custom, according which two babies of a different gender cannot be baptized in the same baptismal font, namely, in the same sanctified water, and this is because in this manner they acquire spiritual kinship and become siblings. This spiritual kinship would become an impediment to their marriage in the future, or, if this was possibly done out of ignorance, the ones married would commit a grave sin. A consequence of this notion is the fact that nowadays, at least as far as I know, they do not baptize babies of a different gender in the same water and, at great shrines, where many are baptized on the same day, they have two baptismal fonts, one for male and the other for female babies, or they change the water when they begin to baptize infants of another gender. The answer to the question posed above would be very simple, given that the children of a different gender are siblings according to the flesh, nothing would also prevent them from becoming spiritual siblings. The possibility of marriage between them is in any case not possible.

However, this custom *per se* must, I think, concern us further. In principle, it does not have any support in liturgical practice and in the historical tradition of the Church. In the ancient period, men and women were baptized in baptistries in the same water, irrespective of gender. It is a misunderstanding to be thinking that baptism in the same water creates a spiritual kinship that would impede marriage in the future. Rather, theologically, baptism creates a spiritual kinship and makes all human beings to be brethren in Christ, children of God, and members of his Church. But the mystery of baptism in its entirety is celebrated whether in a different place or in a different time. From the day of Pentecost, when the first 3,000 Christians were baptized up until this very hour when the last infant is baptized, and in every race and place, from one end of the earth to the other, baptism is "one,"[449] a single mystery common to all eras and common to all human beings. And this brotherhood and

449. Eph 4:5.

sisterhood in Christ, which is acquired with holy baptism, not only does it not constitute an impediment to the union of two human beings in the communion of marriage, but even is a condition for it, since marriage between a baptized person and an unbaptized person, namely, between a Christian and a non-Christian, is not permitted by the Church.

Does not precisely the same thing also come about for the mystery of the Holy Eucharist? With the communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord, do not all human beings of all eras and regions of the earth, and of both genders become one body, members of Christ, united in body and united in blood with Christ, and with each other? Does this constitute an impediment for wedlock? On the contrary, it is a condition for the contracting of a blessed marriage in Christ.

Similar customs and understandings have entered our worship in times of decline, in a period where baptism *en masse* ceased to be celebrated during great feasts, chiefly of Pascha and Theophany, was separated from the Divine Liturgy and the festive synaxis of the faithful, and was changed into a family affair. At the time, they rushed to baptize their infants as quickly as possible, separately one by one and at any time whatsoever. In the era, obviously, of the Tourkokratia,[450] due to the particular conditions under which it lived, the Church also permitted baptism to be performed in homes, a fact that also contributed to the complete liturgical decay of the sacred rite. At the time, various popular notions and superstitions found ground to penetrate, like also this one about which we are speaking. Now that the exterior obstacles have been eliminated through the grace of God, it would be desirable for our Church to return to the ancient correct practice of group celebration of baptisms during great feasts in brilliant festal synaxes such as took place in the era of the zenith of our Church in conjunction with the Divine Liturgy. Then, of course, with the appropriate illumination, all the consequences of the decline will also be gone or at least the causes will be absent that resulted in all of these pious misunderstandings.

450. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

202

During the service of Matins after the gospel reading, when "Save, O God, your people and bless your inheritance . . ."[451] is said by the deacon, or absent a deacon, by the priest, is it appropriate for the priest to bless from the beautiful gate, and indeed with the cross as some priests do, or not?

"Save, O God, your people . . .," of Matins is not a blessing that is directed toward the people, but an entreaty directed to God. For this reason, it is said by the deacon and improperly[452] by the priest when a deacon is not present during the service. The same form of entreaty also exists in the Litē, where it was connected to the Artoklasia in parishes probably from a misunderstanding. Again, the same petition also exists in the service of the Paraklēsis, which was formed according to the model of the service of Matins. In all these instances, this is about "a diaconal prayer," as was said, and not about a blessing. Consequently, some priests are wrongly accustomed to bless during it and indeed with the blessing cross, which is purely a hierarchical privilege. Neither the nature of the prayer, nor any standard rubric, but not even the correct practice that is also observed by most priests on the Holy Mountain, prescribes any blessing at this point.

Indeed, an analogous phrase also exists in a priestly prayer, the prayer of the second antiphon of the Divine Liturgy ("O Lord our God, save your people and bless your inheritance, protect the fullness..."),[453] but no one, and rightly of course, would ever think to combine a blessing with this prayer. And here, this is about an entreaty and not about a blessing.

---

451. "Σῶσον, ὁ Θεός, τὸν λαόν σου καὶ εὐλόγησον τὴν κληρονομίαν σου . . ."
452. "καταχρηστικῶς."
453. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, σῶσον τὸν λαόν σου καὶ εὐλόγησον τὴν κληρονομίαν σου· τὸ πλήρωμα . . ."

The blessing during "Save, O God, your people . . ." of Matins originated, apparently, from its mistaken relationship to the blessing that is given at the end of holy communion, and which is accompanied by precisely the same phrase. A blessing likewise also accompanied the recitation of the analogous phrase of the prayer behind the ambōn, when the prayer behind the ambōn was a dismissal prayer that concluded the Divine Liturgy. This is still observed by some old-time priests and on the Holy Mountain. However, this final blessing of the people, after the addition of the dismissal, has been transferred now to the phrase, "May the blessing and the mercy of the Lord come upon you . . .,"[454] with which the Liturgy concludes. However, things are different in these two instances, namely, at "Save, O God, your people . . ." after communion and formerly during the prayer behind the ambōn. Here, this is about real blessings, which, according to the form that is prevalent in the Eastern Church, are expressed in the third person; while the priest blesses, he is in a sense concealing himself when calling upon God that He might bless the people and His inheritance. Moreover, in this instance, it is clearly noted in the standard rubrics of the manuscripts: "the priest when blessing exclaims saying, 'Save, O God . . .,'" or "the priest blesses saying . . .," or "and he crosses the people," or even more detailed, "and after communing all those wishing, the priest blesses the people, while the deacon holds the holy chalice, while saying in a loud voice, 'Save, O God . . ..'" However, this is not prescribed by any manuscript regarding, "Save, O God, your people . . ." of Matins or of the Litē.

454. "Εὐλογία Κυρίου καὶ ἔλεος ἔλθοι ἐφ' ὑμᾶς . . ."

203

Some spiritual fathers forbid parents who have daughters who are engaged to partake of the undefiled mysteries. Is this correct? And if the parents have many daughters and their engagement is prolonged, would not it be necessary in this manner for the former to refrain from the mysteries for many years?[455]

I am of the opinion that the spiritual father's prohibition was not well conveyed. This is perhaps about a specific case of parents who with their tolerance or even with their approval become a cause for inappropriate conduct to occur between the young engaged, which the Church condemns. Certainly, the same would also apply for the parents of the engaged.

However, for the priest to forbid communion in general to parents who have children who are engaged; this is incomprehensible. Engagement, even though it is not blessed separate from marriage nowadays by the Church, is a sacred act and in no manner can impede the approach of the engaged themselves to the mysteries, but much more so of their parents. Otherwise, as the questioner very correctly observes, a large segment of Christians would be deprived of the cup of life for many years.

455. At one time in Modern Greek culture, there was general disapproval of unmarried couples even being seen together publicly, unless they were engaged. Major social changes, predominantly in the post-civil war era, resulted in increased tolerance of the cohabitation of couples, engaged or otherwise, and other types of publicly displayed behavior between them. Such changes were reflected in popular culture, particularly in films and theatre of the 1960's and 1970's. During this period of change, some parish priests went so far as to hold the parents responsible, who were perceived to be tolerant of the behavior of their children. The question appears to reflect the social changes and the reaction of such priests.

204

During the blessing, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ . . .be with you all,"[456] of the Divine Liturgy, must the priest hold the aēr and bless the people with it?

205

At "Let us lift up our hearts,"[457] must we also have the aēr in our hand, or must we lay it aside after "Be with you all"[458]?

The blessing of the people by the priest during the proclamation of the apostolic blessing, "The grace . . .," with the aēr is associated with the fanning of the precious gifts. We wrote concerning the fanning in the answer to questions forty-four and forty-five. From the uncovering of the gifts, the deacon fans them with a special fan, a veil, or the aēr in order that insects are driven away from the sacred vessels. When a deacon was not present during the Divine Liturgy, the priest did the fanning for the same reason and with the same means. When gradually the fans disappeared, it became prevalent for the fanning to be done with the aēr alone. In the answer to those questions, we saw that once the purpose for this practice was forgotten, they thought that the movements of the fanning were blessings and that the priest blesses the gifts when moving the aēr. These movements then became crosswise blessings. The blessing of the gifts with the aēr was easy to be also extended to the faithful, since indeed the priest, who carried out the fanning, was trying not to interrupt this work except only for a minimum amount of time, lest the gifts remain exposed at the disposal of "flying animals,"[459] as the texts record.[460] If we indeed take under consideration that during an intervening era the priest did not exit at all from the beautiful gate in order to turn toward the people, either at "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ . . ." or

456. "Ἡ χάρις τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . εἴη μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν."
457. "Ἄνω σχῶμεν τὰς καρδίας."
458. "Εἴη μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν."
459. "Ἱπταμένων ζώων."
460. *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.12 (ANF 7:486).

at "Let us lift up our hearts . . .," and so forth, we also understand why he did not set aside the veil not even for an instant, nor did he interrupt the task of fanning. This precisely is also done nowadays in the monasteries on the Holy Mountain; the beautiful gate is closed after the entrance of the gifts and remains closed up until the time of the communion of the people. The dialogue, with which the anaphora begins, and the blessings, are given from the bēma without opening the curtain.

However, we can conclude from the witness of the manuscripts that the blessing with the aēr at "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ . . ." is a much later custom that entered into our liturgical practice during the years of the Tourkokratia.[461] None of them speaks regarding a blessing with the aēr, nor do the printed editions, apart from, at least as far as I know, the *Hierotelestikon* of Archbishop Chrysostomos (of Philippi and Neapolis) of blessed memory,[462] the edition of the Liturgies of Saliveros, and the 1962 Hieratikon of Apostolikē Diakonia. Indeed, in contrast, the indications of the manuscripts are unequivocal and attest unanimously that the aēr was not found in the hands of the priest at the moment of the proclamation of the apostolic blessing. Thus, the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Patriarch Philotheos of Constantinople expressly prescribes that when the deacon says, "Let us stand aright,"[463] "the priest lifts up the aēr from the holy elements . . . and after kissing removes it and exclaims as follows, 'The grace . . ..'"[464] The priest does not indeed even fold the aēr, but rather the deacon, who after his entrance into the holy bēma, "folds the aēr and the veils and lays them aside." The standard rubrics of manuscripts of the Liturgies also attest accordingly.

The standard rubric of the *Codex Sinai 986* from the fifteenth century is characteristic: "the priest folds the aēr, saying inaudibly, 'Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy on

461. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

462. Χρυσόστομος Φιλίππων καὶ Νεαπόλεως, *Ἱεροτελεστικόν* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1948).

463. "Στῶμεν καλῶς."

464. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 11.

us,' and kissing it, he places it above the veil of the paten, so as to make a shape of the cross by the two and immediately exclaims, 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . .' The deacon upon entering and taking the fan or veil drives away the flies from the holy elements."

It is also attested to by the hierarchical Liturgy that the blessing was not given with the aër, during which the serving hierarch always blesses with the hand or the cross and not with the aër, and this, because the hierarch never fanned the holy elements, but the deacon does, or, in the absence of a second deacon, one of the concelebrating priests.

Therefore, since the blessing with the aër at "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ . . ." does not have any meaning nor is it attested to by tradition, much more unjustified is the elevation of the aër at "let us lift up our hearts." This is due to an analogous reason; namely, inasmuch as it became prevalent for the priest to bless with the aër, he also continued to hold it during the dialogue with the people, accompanying his traditional gestures with it. The intermediate practice, namely, to lay aside the aër after the blessing did not have a reason to exist, since also the blessing is wrongly given with it and would compel the priest to return to the altar at the time of the dialogue, a thing that would result in his pointless movements.

According to the above, the aër, after the fanning and before the apostolic blessing, must be left by the priest on the holy table, "aside"[465] as it is attested to by the manuscripts.

465. "ἐν μέρει."

206

Some of the priests, when they are about to cense, bless the incense with the prayer, "Incense we offer to you, O Christ our God . . .."[466] Others say this blessing only at the proskomidē, but bless it with, "Blessed is our God . . . ,"[467] in other instances. Which of the two is more correct?

According to the prevailing practice nowadays, the prayer of incense, "Incense we offer to you . . .," is said only during the service of the prothesis, but in all the other instances during the Divine Liturgy the blessing for the incense is done with, "Blessed is our God . . .."

Indeed, it is curious that in the Liturgies of the Byzantine Typikon, which our Church observes, there does not exist a prayer of incense apart from the one above, "Incense we offer to you . . .." Certainly, in the ancient manuscripts and in the first printed editions, this prayer does not even exist because the Liturgy begins from the prayer of the prothesis, "O God, our God, who did send forth the heavenly bread . . .."[468] In as many manuscripts where the prothesis precedes the Liturgy, the above prayer is also contained. The blessing of incense and the recitation of the prayer in question during prothesis is provided for in the same way also in the *Diataxis* of Philotheos: "Then [the deacon], taking the censer and putting incense in it, says to the priest, 'Bless, Master, the incense. Let us pray to the Lord.' And the priest says the prayer of incense, 'Incense we offer to you . . .'"[469] In the other instances of offering incense during the Divine Liturgy, namely, before the gospel reading, before the great entrance, and after communion, the *Diataxis* of Philotheos, as well as also the standard rubrics of the manuscripts of the Liturgies, are not so clear. Thus, the *Diataxis* notes in these cases, "after the [priest] has blessed in the usual manner and said the prayer, he censes . . ."[470] or "he blesses it, saying the prayer of incense," or

466. "Θυμίαμά σοι προσφέρομεν, Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . ."
467. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . ."
468. Ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεός, ὁ τὸν οὐράνιον ἄρτον . . ."
469. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 4.
470. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 7.

"receiving the blessing for the incense as usual,"[471] or "the deacon raises the censer while also the priest blesses it," "and after blessing the incense,"[472] or "he seals it while saying the prayer of the incense." The standard rubrics incorporated within the text of the Liturgy also note similar things. It is not possible for anyone to determine which prayer of incense is intended here. In any case, the prayer, "Blessed is our God . . .," is not encountered in the manuscripts as a prayer of incense, and rightly, because it has no relationship either with the blessing nor with the offering of incense. Perhaps originally there did not exist any prayer of blessing, but the blessing was given only by means of a crosswise sealing and afterwards they also combined the phrase, "Blessed is our God . . .," in order that a form of prayer is said according to custom.

In the Archieratikon (publication of the Apostolikē Diakonia, 1971), the prayer of incense, "Incense we offer to you . . ." is encountered twice, before the gospel reading and at the cheroubikon. It is justified during the cheroubikon, because there, according to the ancient taxis, the proskomidē was performed by the hierarch; consequently, the prayer here refers to the offering of incense for the prothesis and not to the censing that takes place during the cheroubikon.

This ambiguity became a cause for local variations to be observed even nowadays, to which the questioner refers. The most simple and widespread practice, which we noted at the beginning, appears to be more correct. Namely, the prayer, "Incense we offer to you . . ." is said during the prothesis and "Blessed is our God . . ." in the other cases.

In any case, in the Liturgies of the other liturgical forms, special prayers are provided in every case of offering incense, similar to that said in the prothesis and even more extensive. For example, in the Jerusalemite Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, we have prayers of incense before the entrance, before the gospel reading, after the placement

471. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 9.
472. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 15.

of the precious gifts on the holy table, and after holy communion.[473] Likewise, also for the Alexandrian Liturgy of Saint Markos, special prayers of incense exist before the entrance, before the gospel reading, before the entrance of the precious gifts, before the kiss, and during the prayer of the anaphora.[474] For this reason, we noted at the beginning that the absence of special prayers of incense is somewhat curious in our Liturgies.

As for the other services, and especially for the services of Vespers and Matins, even here the codices do not enlighten us. It appears that as often as incense was about to be offered, it was simply sealed crosswise. Nowadays, "Blessed is our God . . ." is also said. This is provided for by the *Diataxis of Hierodeaconship* of Patriarch Philotheos in the case of the offering of incense at "Lord, I have cried to you"[475] of Vespers.[476] Modern printed editions introduce the prayer, "Incense we offer to you . . .," but I think wrongly, because the prayer of the entrance, "In the evening and in the morning and at noonday . . .,"[477] can be considered a special prayer of offering incense during Vespers, in which there exists an allusion to the offering of incense ("direct our prayer as incense before you").[478] In any case, at least as far as I can tell, the manuscripts do not provide any prayer of blessing incense in any instance, except the prayer, "Incense we offer to you . . .," at the prothesis.

An allusion is made to the prayer of incense, "Incense we offer to you . . .," by Symeōn of Thessaloniki (*Dialogue*, chapter 309) when he refers to the censing of the enarxis for the service of Matins. How-

473. For texts of the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, see Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 3′ (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 65–146; and B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946).

474. For texts of the Liturgy of Saint Markos, see Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 3′ (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994); and Geoffrey J. Cuming, ed., *The Liturgy of Saint Mark*, OCA 234 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990).

475. "Κύριε ἐκέκραξα πρὸς σέ . . ."

476. PG 154:752c.

477. "Ἑσπέρας καὶ πρωῒ καὶ μεσημβρίας . . ."

478. "κατεύθυνον τὴν προσευχὴν ἡμῶν ὡς θυμίαμα ἐνώπιον σου . . ."

ever, no one can conclude with certainty that the prayer in question was said at the time because on the occasion of that censing, Symeōn in a general way analyzes the theological meaning of the offering of incense while basing himself on the words of the relevant prayer ("The priest censes the altar, the temple, and everyone, since everything is sanctified, honoring the former[479] as divine, and sanctifying those present. And for which reason, beginning from the holy of holies, of the altar, he censes everything, not simply censing, but sealing, sanctifying, offering by a prayer dedicated to Christ, and seeking that [the incense] be received above and that the grace of the All-holy Spirit be sent down to us; so that we receive grace through the incense; and let no one neglect the censing").[480]

To be precise, let us note that in manuscripts there also exists a "prayer of incense for one 'fallen asleep'" (*Coisl. 213* of the National Library in Paris from the eleventh century), but it is not in use nowadays. In the same codex, the prayer, "Incense we offer to you . . .," was also said in the procession.

207

After the return of the procession of the epitaphios during the service of Matins of Great Saturday, why is the epitaphios placed on the holy table and remains stretched out on it up until the leavetaking of Pascha, the Wednesday before Ascension? Would it not be preferable for the epitaphios to put back in its place since the Lord is risen?

The placement of the epitaphios on the holy table is linked to the meaning that is given to the latter, namely, that it represents the tomb of Christ. Thus, after the lamentation upon the grave and the procession of the body of the Lord, which in some manner is a reen-

479. Namely, the altar and temple.

480. PG 155:564d–565a. Compare the translation in Harry L.N. Simmons, trans., *St. Symeon of Thessalonike, Treatise on Prayer* (Brookline, MA: Hellenic College Press, 1984), 28; and the Modern Greek translation, Συμεών, Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Θεσσαλονίκης, *Τὰ ἅπαντα, ἐκ τῆς ἀρχαίας εἰς τὴν ὁμιλουμένην μετενεχθέντα πρὸς ψυχωφελῆ χρῆσιν τῶν εὐλαβῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἱερέων καὶ λαϊκῶν: ἐγκρίσει τῆς ἱερᾶς συνόδου τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος μετὰ πολλῶν διορθώσεων κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον κείμενον* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, n.d.), 249.

actment of the carrying out of His body, a reenactment of His burial is also done by the placement of the epitaphios on the holy table—the tomb of Christ. But as much as the answer to this first part of the question is self-evident, the explanation of the practice to which the other part of the question refers is just as difficult, namely, because the epitaphios remains stretched out on the holy table up until the leavetaking of Pascha.

We must go back a little into the historical development of the epitaphios. In the period just before the thirteenth century, the priest did not "enter" bearing the epitaphios during the aposticha of Vespers of Great Friday as nowadays but bore the Gospel book sideways on the shoulder wrapped in the aër. It was exposed in this manner for veneration and was carried in procession during the "asmatic" trisagion of the doxology of the Matins of Great Saturday. According to the symbolic explanations of the Fathers, the Gospel book represents Christ, and the aër, according to the same explanations, represents the winding-sheet of Joseph and Nikodēmos, with which they wrapped the dead body of the Lord. These symbolisms not only strongly influenced liturgical practice, but even the form of the aër. Namely, while the aër, as the name denotes, was originally a light veil with which the gifts were covered for purely practical reasons—for this reason, it was also called a "cloud,"[481] "veil,"[482] or "topmost veil"[483]— it began to be adorned with representations influenced by the symbolisms that were attributed to it. The dead Christ is portrayed on it, the "lamb," alone or with angels with fans, with the four evangelists, or, finally, in the developed form of the portrayal of the lamentation upon the grave, namely, with the Theotokos, John, the myrrhbearers, Joseph, and Nikodēmos. Quite a few such famous embroidered epitaphioi are preserved from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries onwards. Among the most ancient and important of these is the so-called "Epitaphios of Thessaloniki" from the temple of Panagouda in Thessaloniki from where it originates, which is pre-

481. "νεφέλη."
482. "πέπλον."
483. "ἀνώτατον πέπλον."

served in the Byzantine Museum of Athens.[484] The dead Christ is portrayed in the middle, surrounded by angels with fans, in the four corners the symbols of the evangelists and on the two ends the communion of the apostles, "Take, eat" and "Drink of it all." Thus, the aēr was transformed into an epitaphios. Symeōn of Thessaloniki also describes this type of aēr/epitaphios in his *Dialogue*: "Then finally, he places the aēr [namely, after the other veils of the gifts during the service of the Prothesis] . . . which indeed signifies both the firmament in which was the star, and also the winding-sheet; for this reason it often bears in procession Jesus dead, anointed with myrrh, and is called epitaphios, and this teaches purely the mystery to its very end, as if on a tablet" (chapter 96).[485]

This change had immediate consequences in the Liturgy and in the service of Great Friday respectively. Namely, the old simple and light aēr was placed during the great entrance "in the left hand of the deacon" (*National Library of Athens 802*) or, more accurately, "on the left shoulder of the deacon" (*Athens 751, 752, 757, 766, Panteleēmonos 6277-770*, et al.) and in the absence of a deacon the priest placed it "on his own shoulder" (*Athens 751, Esphigmenou 120*). After its conversion into an epitaphios, the importance of this covering was emphasized and its transfer from the prothesis to the altar during the great entrance took place in a manner proportionate to its importance. Namely, in the great concelebrations, after the sacred vessels it was carried by the deacons "upon the head." The codices attest to this: *Hagiou Saba 362 (607)* from the fourteenth century and *Athens 754* from the seventeenth century ("behind everyone"—or "behind all"—"the deacons holding the aēr upon their heads"), as well as Symeōn of Thessaloniki ("after them, all the others and those carrying upon their head the sacred great veil

484. For a description and illustration of the Epitaphios of Thessaloniki, see Anastasia Drandaki, et al, eds., *Heaven & Earth: Art of Byzantium from Greek Collections* (Athens: National Gallery of Art, 2013), 1:155–157, and Roland Betancourt, "The Thessaloniki Epitaphios: Notes on Use and Context," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 55 (2015): 489–535.

485. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessaloníka*, 235.

that has the depiction of Jesus naked and dead," *Explanation,* 76).[486] In the depictions of the angelic Divine Liturgy that we have in the apse of many temples of this period (Mystra, Kaisarianē,[487] and so forth), the procession of the great entrance is precisely portrayed and after the gifts angels bear the epitaphios "upon the head" with great piety.[488] The covering of the vessels after their placement on the holy table took place in an analogous manner to Great Friday, namely, while saying the troparion, "The noble Joseph . . .,"[489] and while "all the hierarchs, priests and deacons are touching it together" (*Hagiou Saba 362*). Technical reasons also brought about the change in the manner that the aēr/epitaphios was carried during the great entrance. If a priest served with only one deacon, the aēr was placed on the back of the deacon ("he takes the aēr and lays it on the back of the deacon," *Athens 749*), as nowadays, or upon the head of the deacon in a manner hanging over his back ("upon the head of the deacon . . . accordingly covering the head of the deacon, as we said, with the aēr, and the aēr hanging from the forehead to the back," *Sinai 986*). The priest carried the aēr in a similar manner also when he served by himself; namely, he suspended it, as also nowadays, on his shoulders or placed it upon his head and back, just as the epitaphios during the procession of Great Friday. During the era of the Tourkokratia,[490] the aēr and the epitaphios were separated and the aēr returned to its original simple form, while the epitaphios was retained but only for the service of Great Friday.

Moreover, in the service of the unnailing and the lamentation upon the grave, the new form of the aēr with the depiction of the dead Christ took center position. While before it was simply the type of the winding-sheet inside of which the Gospel book was

---

486. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeon of Thessalonika,* 127.

487. This refers to the Kaisarianē Monastery on Mount Ymittos overlooking Athens.

488. For a discussion of the iconographic programs of Byzantine sanctuaries, see Sharon E. J. Gerstel, *Beholding the Sacred Mysteries, Programs of the Byzantine Sanctuary* (Seattle: College Art Association, 1999).

489. "Ὁ εὐσχήμων Ἰωσήφ . . ."

490. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

wrapped, now it becomes the body itself of the Christ that is buried. The Gospel book was retained and exposed for veneration together with the epitaphios during the aposticha of Great Friday and carried in procession during the Matins of Great Saturday, but the center of gravity fell on the epitaphios. This is what "is buried," as we saw in the beginning, when placed in the tomb of Christ, on the holy table, after the procession/funeral of the Matins of Great Saturday.

At this point, the answer to the question is found why the epitaphios remains on the holy table throughout the entire Paschal period. During the Paschal Liturgies of this period, the carrying of the aēr/epitaphios during the great entrance was not consistent with the entire resurrectional color. For this reason, it also remained, and by tradition it still remains up until nowadays, stretched out on the holy table up until the leavetaking of Pascha, even after the separation of the aēr and the epitaphios.

The celebration of the Divine Liturgy on the epitaphios, when it is constructed according to Russian models, with the depictions very embossed, presents some technical difficulties. For this reason, also, in some temples, it is transferred to another holy table, if there is one, stretched out in the center of the sanctuary, or a simple epitaphios with the body of the Lord painted is used, or an antimēnsion that has the burial of Christ portrayed.

This is the historical origin and the meaning of this custom. The practical reasons that brought about its creation certainly no longer exist because the epitaphios/aēr is no longer carried in procession during the great entrance. But fair enough, and there is no serious reason for us to think about its revision.

208

In the service that is performed if anything impure happens to fall into a vessel, the Euchologion records that the priest sprinkles the vessel with water from holy Theophany. Many maintain that we must use the water from the eve and not from the day of Theophany. Which is more correct?

According to the printed and the manuscript Euchologia, the "water of holy Theophany" or the "Hagiasma of holy Theophany" is used during the service that is performed, "If anything polluted whatsoever happens to fall into a cistern" or "If anything polluted or impure recently fell into a vessel of wine or honey or any other thing" or "Over polluted vessels," as well as also "For a field or for a vineyard or for a garden, if it happens to be infested by snakes or other species." The priests also put "water from holy Theophany" into the oil of unction, according to the *Codex Sinai 973*. In none of the above instances, is it prescribed by the standard rubrics of the Euchologia whether this Hagiasmos is from the eve or from the feast day of Theophany. And quite correctly. Because as we have written repeatedly (see the answers to questions 31, 35, 79, 126, and 158), the service of the Great Hagiasmos is one and the same, whether it is celebrated on the eve or on the day of the feast of Theophany. And just as the Divine Liturgy is one and the same whether celebrated on Pascha, the Nativity, Sunday, or any other day of the year, and the communicant always communes the Body and Blood of Christ, thus also in the service of the Great Hagiasmos, the water being blessed is changed into a Great Hagiasmos by the visitation of the Holy Spirit on either of the two days the service is performed. The double celebration of the service came from purely practical reasons, namely, the convenience of the faithful. From similar reasons, the double celebration of the Divine Liturgy also came about on Pascha, the Nativity, and Theophany. As is well known, on the above feasts, we have two Liturgies within one liturgical day, namely, one after Vespers—the ancient Liturgy of the all-night vigil—and one after Matins. And nowadays in many temples of large cities, two Liturgies are celebrated on Sundays and other feasts. It would be inconceivable in all the above cases if anyone

distinguished between a first and second Liturgy as to the efficacy of the mystery performed. The distinction of the Hagiasmos of the eve and Hagiasmos of the feast is of purely popular origin, analogous to the distinction that is made between the antidōron of Great Thursday and the antidōron of other days.

It must be noted that the old Typika, such as for example, that of Saint Sophia of Constantinople from the tenth century (*Codex T. Staurou 40* and *Patmos 266*) and of the Evergetis from the twelfth century (*Codex Athens 788*), provide for the performance of the Great Hagiasmos only during the Vespers of the eve, namely, during the all-night vigil. It must be likewise noted that also up until the sixteenth century, as we ascertain from the manuscripts, opposition against the double celebration of the Great Hagiasmos was not lacking. For example, the Typikon "of the ecclesiastical rite of the Holy Lavra in Jerusalem of our Blessed Father Sabas"[491] from the year 1528 (*Codex Dmitrievskii*)[492] characteristically notes the following: "It is necessary to know concerning holy Theophany that the Typikon of the Great Church prescribes to illuminate[493] one time and only at Vespers, which was handed down from the holy Fathers; in

491. "τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας λαύρας τοῦ ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάβα." For another edition of the Typikon of Saint Sabas and a discussion of its text, see Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012).

492. А. А. Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, 3:317.

493. "φωτίζειν." This term most likely refers to the blessing of waters to baptize and perhaps also includes the baptism of catechumens. According to Robert Allison, "Black Mountain: Regulations of Nikon of the Black Mountain," in Thomas and Hero, 1:420, n. 129:

> . . . phōtizein, "to illumine," apparently refers to the ceremony of blessing the water which constitutes the main event of the feast of the Epiphany, and which developed from the early practice of baptizing catechumens on the feasts of the Epiphany and Easter. Known as the megas hagiasmos, it takes place both on the vigil of Epiphany and on the following morning. Controversy of the repetition of the ceremony is attested as early as the mid-fifth-century decree of Peter Gnapheus, patriarch of Jerusalem, which held that the blessing of the waters should be celebrated only a vespers. It is to this controversy that Nikon undoubtedly alludes in this chapter; he makes reference to readings from the prophets which are part of the office of the hagiasmos.

like manner also the synaxaria and in like manner the divine Gospel books themselves, the Apostolos, and the readings of the prophets handed down for public use, and for monks, equally also the Typika of the holy monastery of Stoudios and that of Jerusalem, also prescribe only at Vespers, nothing more. But presently, we see some [illuminate] at Vespers and in the morning, and nevertheless did not appeal to scriptural testimony. But if any of the ones who love labor[494] appealed to valid scriptural testimony about this, let him enlighten us, because imitating without holy Scripture brings much danger; much more now, because by not following holy Scriptures, we were delivered up to the gentiles.[495] Nevertheless, I know not whether inspired knowledge might hold that our Lord Jesus Christ was baptized one time and not a second time, let the one who has inspired knowledge enlighten us"[496] (similarly also see in the *Codex Patriarchate of Jerusalem 309* from the fourteenth century).[497]

Another note of the *Codex Vatopediou 321* comes as a response to the objections against the double celebration of the Great Hagiasmos and as an explanation for this practice: "It seemed strange to some that the Hagiasmos of holy Theophany is performed twice and for proof of their own argument they put forward as a defense that the Lord was baptized once; for how irrefutable this can seem

494. The word, φιλόπονος, appears to be used in a mocking way, implying that by performing two Great Hagiasmoi, those doing so are ones who "love work."

495. Given the sixteenth century context, the words, "τοῖς ἔθνεσιν" (gentiles, heathen), may refer to Western or Turkish invaders of the Byzantine Empire.

496. Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, 3:324. The last sentence also appears to have a mocking tone. The entire text duplicates Nikōn of the Black Mountain, *Taktikon* 92 in Владимир Бенешевич (Vladimir Benešević), ed., Тактикон Никона Черногорца: Греческий текст по рукописи № 441 Синайского монастыря св. Екатерины Бенешевич В. (St. Petersburg, 1917), 67. Compare the translation in Robert Allison, "Black Mountain: Regulations of Nikon of the Black Mountain," in Thomas and Hero, 1:416. Nikōn of the Black Mountain (Νίκων τοῦ ἐν τῷ Μαύρῳ Ὄρει) was born ca. 1025 in Constantinople, died in the early twelfth century, lived on the Black Mountain in Syria near Antioch, and was the author of liturgical, ascetical, and canonical works. This discussion is based on Alexander Kazhdan, "Nikon of the Black Mountain," *ODB* 3:1484–1485.

497. Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, 3:201.

to those who do not know the reason on account of which this was prescribed to be performed. Therefore, after properly giving a reason here to those with good sense, we will leave undisputed the truth of what must be done. Thus, it has been legislated in the *Constitutions of the Holy Apostles* for the Liturgy to be celebrated on the eve of holy Theophany around midnight and immediately after this the Hagiasmos also to be celebrated on Christ's behalf around midnight on account of this mystery. At any rate, since the revered monasteries in the regions of Jerusalem, but indeed also churches, and especially those near the Jordan, were compelled to celebrate the Hagiasmos indeed in the Jordan River itself for a more complete commemoration of the mystery, but time did not easily afford this, on account of the Liturgy extending until midnight, as has been explained, it was also much more necessary that they contrived the celebration of the Hagiasmos immediately after Liturgy to be done twice; at Vespers due to the requirement of the time in the churches immediately after the Liturgy, and in the morning at the Jordan river on account of the commemoration of the mystery that was accomplished in it, and this has been done by those ever since then up until now. Since the Typikon has also been transferred from there, namely, from the Lavra of Saint Sabas, to other places where there are holy monasteries and churches, it prescribes this to be celebrated twice.[498] This is not redundant, as it seems to me, but exceedingly consistent with the tradition of the holy Fathers."[499] Likewise, the *Codex Vatopediou 320* attributes the double celebration of the Great Hagiasmos to a Jerusalemite custom: "on the next day, all assemble with the patriarch and celebrate such an Hagiasmos also in the Jordan River, certainly for the reason that the present Typikon was derived from those of the Jerusalemite monasteries . . . the double blessing of the waters has been prescribed in this manner according to the Jerusalemite monastic custom."[500] Theophilos of Kampania in *Treasury of Orthodoxy*

498. In Greece, on the morning of Theophany after Liturgy, the celebration at the Jordan appears echoed in the custom of processing to the closest body of water, into which a blessing cross is thrown and then retrieved.

499. Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, 3:462.

500. Дмитриевский, Описание литургических рукописей, 3:456.

attempts to give an explanation for the double celebration; he cites practical reasons, the "illumination"[501] of "houses, fields, pens, and every exterior and interior dwelling of humans and animals," which was done by the priests on the eve; "for on Theophany, a day of the Lord, it is not appropriate for the priests to go around and to annoy others" (chapter 67, 7th edition, p. 150).[502] The thought does not even enter all those above that there exists any difference between the one and the other blessing of the water. As for the explanation of Paisios of Gaza,[503] whom Blessed Nikodēmos mentions in the *Rudder* in a footnote to canon sixty-five of the Penthektē Council, that the one of the eve "is a type of the baptism of John . . . and on this account it is done humbly " and that of the feast day "is a type of the baptism of the Lord . . . and on this account it is done with boldness and a procession," this is a pious explanation, but without any historical or liturgical support.[504] These points are supplementary to what we wrote on another occasion.

---

501. "φώτισμα."

502. Θεόφιλος, Ἐπίσκοπος Καμπανίας, *Ταμεῖον Ὀρθοδοξίας περιέχον συνοπτικῶς καὶ διαλαμβάνον περὶ Θεοῦ, περὶ Πίστεως, περὶ ἐξηγήσεως καὶ χρήσεως τῶν ἑπτὰ Μυστηρίων, δέκα Ἐντολῶν, καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαιοτέρων τῆς Ἱερᾶς Ἐκκλησίας ἐθίμων*, 7th ed. (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, n.d.), 150.

503. Paisios Ligaridēs (Παΐσιος Λιγαρίδης), ca. 1609 or 1610–1678, originally from a Greek Catholic family in Chios, studied at the College of Saint Athanasius in Rome, and was ordained a Roman Catholic deacon and priest (1639). Although supported by the *Congregatio de propaganda fide*, Parthenios I of Constantinople (r. 1639–1644) declared him to be a sacred preacher of the Patriarchate (1643). He travelled to Rumania as an Orthodox sacred preacher and teacher, where he became acquainted (1651) with Paisios the Patriarch of Jerusalem (r. 1645–1660), who ordained him as metropolitan of Gaza (1652) after making an Orthodox confession. As metropolitan of Gaza, he travelled to Russia where he allied himself with Nikon of Moscow, but eventually joined his opponents and took a leading role in his trial. After becoming an adviser to the Tsar, he died in Kiev on August 24, 1678. Most of his works remain unpublished. For biographical details and bibliography, see Cyril Mango, *The Homilies of Photios Patriarch of Constantinople, English Translation, Introduction, and Commentary* (Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, 1958), 12–17, and B. N. Γιαννόπουλος, "Παΐσιος Ὁ Λιγαρίδης," *ΘΗΕ* 9:1060-61.

504. Ἁγάπιος Ιερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 278, n. 1.

In all the temples, a holy water font of Great Hagiasmos is maintained to be given to the faithful who are impeded from holy communion and for other liturgical uses, such as the ones that we mentioned at the beginning. Reserving water from the two celebrations of the same Hagiasmos and making a distinction between one or the other's use would be a concession to simplistic pious views, liturgically unjustified and inadmissible.

209

In various services, why is the epistle reading read first and afterwards the gospel reading, and why is more veneration given during the reading of the gospel than the epistle, given that both are readings from the books of the New Testament?

210

I saw in a certain temple that in order for the epistle reading to take place, a type of small entrance must occur. Namely, the reader receives the book from the priest, exits from the north door while two boys precede with candles, ascends the throne, and reads the epistle reading from there. Is this correct?

Question 111 deals with a similar inquiry. The question at that time was whether the practice observed by some priests is correct, namely, whether the Apostolos is given by the priest to the reader, received back again after the reading, and placed on the holy table. We answered at that time that this is case of a pious innovation, but unjustified theoretically, historically, and practically. Father P. Athanasiou supported the opposite position in a letter that was published in the January 1, 1968, issue of *Ὁ Ἐφημέριος*, volume 17, pp. 40–41.[505] Both the above questions bring us back to the subject; the first question by referring to the theoretical view of the matter and the second question to a practice somewhat similar to that which at that time occupied us. It is certainly presented this time in an improved form.

Those who perhaps have a contrary opinion to that which we expressed at that time will permit us to insist on it, because we are

505. *Ὁ Ἐφημέριος* 17 (1968): 40–41.

convinced regarding its correctness. In principle, we do not doubt the good and pious intention of those who propose it. Professor V. Vellas of blessed memory, in *Ὁ Ἐφημέριος* (vol. 4 [1955], pp. 132–134), on the occasion of the publication of the Apostolos by the Apostolikē Diakonia, wrote an article and, while welcoming, so to speak, that publication, referred to the pitiful condition in which the Apostolos is found in certain temples and the disrespect with which it is handled by some.[506] He referred to a custom of the Ionian islands, which he endorsed, and proposed for its general adoption, which is precisely what question 111 also referred to. Fr. Gervasios Paraskevopoulos of blessed memory also discusses the handover of the Apostolos to the reader by the priest in his book, *An Interpretive Overview on the Divine Liturgy* (Patras, 1958, p. 122).[507] This practice entered into a liturgical book for the first time in the edition of the Hieratikon of Apostolikē Diakonia from the year 1962, pp. 118–119: "After the reader receives the Apostolos from the priest and kisses his hand, he stands . . . After completing the epistle reading . . . the reader, making a prostration, gives the Apostolos to the priest while kissing his right hand." At that time, this practice began to spread more, and the producers of ecclesiastical vessels presented us with silver-bound epistle books in imitation of the Gospel books with the two Chief Apostles, the twelve, the apostle Andrew, and other relevant or irrelevant depictions on the covers. These books also found a place on the holy table next to the Gospel book. A second step is the "entrance" of the Apostolos, which is the subject of question 210.

We ought to emphasize the fact that these innovations are not consistent with the correct liturgical tradition of the Church. Our generation has rights but also responsibilities in the presence of this tradition. As much as carelessness about the maintenance and the reverent reading of the Apostolos must be condemned, so too the excesses in reaction must be avoided. The Apostolos is a book that belongs to the choir and not in the bēma; for precisely also this reason it contains the prokeimena, allēlouaria, koinōnika, and antiphons of

506. Βασίλειος Βέλλας, *Ὁ Ἐφημέριος* 4 (1955): 132–134.

507. Γερβάσιος Χαρ. Παρασκευόπουλος, *Ἑρμηνευτικὴ ἐπιστασία ἐπὶ τῆς θείας λειτουργίας* (Πάτραι: n.p., 1958), 122.

the Divine Liturgy. The Psalter contains psalms from the Old Testament and the other liturgical books of the choir contain readings from the Old and the New Testaments and psalms. These texts are equally divinely inspired and sacred, just as also the epistle pericopes that are contained in the Apostolos. All these books are sacred and the readings and psalms that they contain are sacred, just as also every reading or chanting that takes place during divine worship. Both the function of the reader and the chanter are equally sacred. As for the argument from the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos the Brother of God, it is very weak. In no manuscript of this Liturgy is there attested an entrance with other liturgical books, Apostolos or Old Testament, except the Gospel book.[508] But also, neither do we have from the rest of the liturgical tradition of the Church, anything analogous in the other liturgical forms. The entrance always took place "with the Gospel book" inasmuch as a gospel pericope was to be read. In the answer to question 170, we wrote regarding the historical development of the entrance. The entrance with the Gospel book and the "other scriptures" was introduced into the Divine Liturgy of Iakōvos by Dionysios Latas,[509] Metropolitan of Zakynthos, who published this Liturgy for liturgical use (Zakynthos, 1886), either on the basis of the customs of the Ionian Islands, which Professor V. Vellas mentioned, or even arbitrarily.[510] The relevant standard rubric was also adopted in the edition of Chr. Papadopoulos.[511] The Liturgy in ques-

508. See the critical edition of this Liturgy in B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946).

509. Dionysios Latas (Διονύσιος Λάτας) (1835–1894), archbishop of Zakynthos (1884–1894), a graduate of the Theological Schools of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem and the University of Athens, known for his preaching, travelled throughout Europe and America and published mainly collections of sermons (Ἰω. Χ. Κωνσταντινίδης, "Διονύσιος ὁ Λάτας," *ΘΗΕ* 5:45–47).

510. Διονύσιος Λάτας, *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἐνδόξου Ἀποστόλου Ἰακώβου, τοῦ Ἀδελφοθέου καὶ Πρώτου Ἱεράρχου τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων, ἐκδοθεῖσα μετὰ διαράξεως καὶ σημειώσεων* (Ζάκυνθος: τύποις Καψοκεφάλου, 1886).

511. Χρυσόστομος Παπαδόπουλος, *Περὶ τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Λειτουργίας τοῦ Ἁγίου Ἰακώβου* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἐκ τοῦ Τυπογραφείου τῶν Καταστημάτων Ἀνέστη Κωσταντινίδου, 1901). Chrysostomos Papadopoulos (Χρυσόστομος Παπαδόπουλος) (1868–1938) was Archbishop of Athens and All Greece (1923–1938).

tion knew an interval of several centuries of disuse and elements in it are not preserved in the oral tradition. Its only source is the manuscripts, but these manuscripts, as we have said, speak only of an entrance "with the Gospel book" and nothing else.

And just a parenthetical note about the subject of the "pre-reading" of the epistle reading privately by the reader before its reading in public. Certainly, the ideal is for the prospective reader to study the text at home. That is what we must strive for. The priest must have the related initiative both, from the preceding Sunday, to appoint the reader for the epistle reading of the following Sunday and to give him the book to study the pericope. Thus, reading errors will be avoided, which unfortunately are very common. But, outside of the fact that this ideal is not always observed, at least a quick reading before the reading in public would be very useful. Shall we also bring forth an argument from tradition? According to the Typikon of the Great Church of Constantinople from the tenth century (*T. Staurou 40*), during the Liturgy for the eve of Theophany, the entrance with three Gospel books took place: "three Gospels are brought into the sanctuary, which are carried by three deacons."[512] The first was placed on the holy table, the second on the synthronon, and the deacon who was about to read the gospel kept the third and devoted himself during the time between the entrance and his reading to the pre-reading of the text: "the one about to read takes and studies it." This was done in Saint Sophia, where the deacon ought to be more educated and would read a well-known pericope from the Gospel book. Certainly, the practice attested to by the above Typikon would not only be done during the reading of the pericope for the eve of Theophany. This must apply much more nowadays, where the readers are not professional readers, so to speak, and the epistle texts are more difficult than the gospel readings.

The elevation of the gospel reading in comparison with the epistle, as well as the book the contains the pericopes being read, the "Gospel book," in comparison with the "Apostolos," is not done without reason. The entire traditional taxis of this element of our

512. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:180–181.

Liturgy rests on strong theological foundations. The epistle reading and the "Apostolos" are intentionally placed in a secondary place in comparison with the gospel reading and the "Gospel book." This does not mean that they are not both books of the New Testament and equally God-inspired. Let us not confuse matters; the Fathers who arranged the details of our worship were not less Orthodox than us. Our own obligation is for us to ascertain from the liturgical tradition of our Church how things are and why they are like that. Our inquiry will focus on these two questions.

First of all, the epistle reading is placed before the gospel reading in all liturgical forms. This appears historically inconsistent to us both because the Gospels are placed first in the traditional sequence of the books of the New Testament and because Christ preached first and the apostles afterwards. However, apart from the fact that the Epistles of the apostles are also historically older books of the New Testament, and the reading of Epistles enter our worship first and afterwards that of the Gospels, the Apostolos is read before the Gospel book in order for the importance of the second to be emphasized. In the ancient church, a pericope or pericopes from the Old Testament were read during the Divine Liturgy, as also is done in our Liturgy during the eves of the great feasts and in certain other cases.[513] These were placed before the readings from the New Testament. Namely, we had and have an ascending scale: Old Testament—Epistles—Gospel. As Christ sent the apostles "ahead of him" (Luke 10:1), so also the epistle reading occurs "ahead" of the gospel reading. And just as precisely in our ecclesiastical processions those having lower ranks come before and the priests and bishops follow, so also the gospel reading comes last in the sequence of readings.

The Gospel book was read by the deacon or, in his absence, by the priest, but in certain cases by only the priest or even the hierarch. The Apostolos was always read by lower clergy, the reader, and nowadays by the chanter or even by any other person. Candles always preceded the Gospel book, and lights and tapers were lit by the people during its reading as a sign of honor, but also of

513. This order is followed during the Vesperal Liturgies of Great Week.

joy and to symbolize the illumination of Christ through the gospel. Before its reading, incense was offered, during which time the divine hymn, "Alleluia," was chanted. In all the Liturgies, a special prayer is read before the gospel reading, but in some Liturgies, even after it. Before its reading, the deacon received a special blessing, ("May God, through the intercessions . . . grant speech to you who proclaims the Gospel . . ."). [514] Doxological acclamations of the people preceded and followed the reading ("Glory to you, O Lord, glory to you,"[515] "God speaks,"[516] "Praise to you, O Christ,"[517] and so forth). All stood during the reading of the Gospel book, or even prostrated themselves to express sentiments of obedience and extreme respect. A purifying and sanctifying character was attributed to the reading and hearing of the gospel; this is clearly taught by the Fathers and by many prayers that refer to the hearing of the gospel from the various Liturgies. In the skeuophylakia of monasteries from all over the world, gospel manuscripts are preserved, masterpieces of script and ornamentation, with splendid and lavish covers. The Gospel book, alone of the liturgical books, was placed on the holy table—the tomb and the throne of Christ—and on the sacred synthronon, was carried in processions, received kisses and the prostrations of the faithful, and was held, not by bare hands, but with vestments or with special fabrics. None of the aforementioned was done during the reading of the epistle, nor were analogous honors rendered to the book with its pericopes, the "Apostolos."

And all these things are because the Gospel book is the symbol of Christ and during its reading Christ himself is speaking; for this reason, its pericopes begin with "The Lord said." On the other hand, in the Apostolos the "brother" speaks and preaches, admonishes, requests, and teaches his brethren; for this reason, also, it begins with the word, "Brethren."[518] We select some opinions of Fathers who comment on the Divine Liturgy and especially refer to the reason for

514. "Ὁ Θεός, διὰ πρεσβειῶν . . . δῴη σοι ῥῆμα τῷ εὐαγγελιζομένῳ . . ."
515. "Δόξα σοι, Κύριε, δόξα σοι."
516. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁμιλεῖ . . ."
517. "Αἶνος σοι, Χριστέ . . ."
518. Although the plural, "ἀδελφοί," is commonly translated in current use within English-speaking Orthodox churches as "brethren." It can also be

this liturgical differentiation of the epistle from the gospel reading and explain the existing practice of the Church on this point. And firstly, regarding the Apostolos: "The calling of the apostles and their commissioning is made known by the reading of their Acts or Epistles" (Germanos of Constantinople, *Ecclesiastical History and Mystical Contemplation*).[519] "After this, Paul rises like a soldier and makes clear his own teaching to the multitude" (Sōphronios, *Oration containing all ecclesiastical history*, 17).[520] "And immediately the divine reading of the epistle occurs, because Christ, having ascended, sent forth the apostles to proclaim the Lord throughout the whole world" (Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Dialogue*, chapter 98).[521] "Then the apostolic words are read, an act which represents the sending of the apostles to the nations" (Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Explanation*, 64).[522] And regarding the Gospel book: "The gospel is the coming of the Son of God by which he was seen by us no longer speaking through clouds and figures as once he did to Moses . . . but manifestly he truly appeared to us as a man and was seen by us as a gentle and quiet king who once descended noiselessly as rain on fleece" (Germanos, cited above).[523] "The exclamation of the sacred and holy Gospels of Christ himself our God manifests the words, commandments, those laws which he established for us, the passion, the burial, the Resurrection, and the Ascension" (Theodōros of Andida, *Summary Commentary*, 17).[524] "The Gospel is that which reveals the coming of Christ, the Son of God, by which he was seen by us, not through figures but manifestly" (Sōphronios, cited above, 18).[525] "Before the gospel comes the 'Alleluia' hymn, which represents praise of God and the coming of divine grace, which is the reading of the gospel. This reading itself manifests the proclamation of the gospel in the

translated in a gender-inclusive manner as "brothers and sisters," (BDAG, s.v. "Ἀδελφός, οῦ, ὁ,").

519. PG 98:412b.
520. PG 87:3997b.
521. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 247.
522. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 121.
523. PG 98:421d–413a.
524. PG 140:440c.
525. PG 87:3997d–3999a.

whole world by his disciples, which took place after the Ascension of the Lord. Therefore, first the epistle is proclaimed and then the gospel, because the disciples, having first been strengthened, were sent out, then they proclaimed the gospel as they went throughout the world . . . He [Christ] is perceived to be speaking through the gospel" (Symeōn, *Explanation*, 66, 67, 69).[526] "These [readings] of the manifestation are indicative of the more perfect one, during which he mingled in public with all and made himself known not only from what he himself [namely, Christ] said, but also from what he taught the apostles to say when sending them 'to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.'[527] On account of this, the apostolic writings are read and then the gospel itself is read. Therefore, why is the gospel not first? Because it is to signify what was said by the Lord himself is a more perfect manifestation than what was said by the apostles . . . because of this, for those who wish to show that his manifestation took place little by little, it is reasonable to read the apostolic writings before the Gospels. For also on account of this, the readings that are indicative of his perfect manifestation are kept for last" (Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 22.4–5).[528]

The presentation and proper utilization of the epistle reading should be done, but within the boundaries that are provided and prescribed by the liturgical tradition. A serious manner of approaching this requirement would be for us to pursue an improvement of the manner of recitation, as well as the explanation of these texts. Namely, when the reading is done by suitable persons melodiously, according to the traditional manner, but clearly and meaningfully, without reading errors or displays of voice that turn the "reading" into languid chanting. And when the preaching leaves the easy path of the gospel readings for a while and turns toward systematic homiletic commentary on the epistle pericopes, which are difficult but also so fertile in teachings. This work is especially serious and urgent because—let us not deceive ourselves—too few of the people under-

526. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 121.

527. Matt 10:6.

528. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 22.4–5 (SC 4bis:156–157).

stand the epistle texts, even in part. In the past, a systematic attempt, to the extent possible, was made toward this direction in the church of Thessaloniki. During the course of an entire year, the sermon had as its exclusive subject, the epistle pericopes, which indeed were recommended to be read in the holy temple by the sacred preacher himself.[529]

211

Why do we cense the temple during "May the Lord hearken to you in affliction's day . . .,"[530] and so forth? What relationship is there between these psalms and the censing?

212

We have been taught by the old-time priests that during Matins, after "Blessed is our God . . .,"[531] the priest must cense the holy table, the prothesis, the holy icons, and the temple. Is this correct or not?

We saw in the answers to questions seventeen and ninety-five that incense is offered before the Divine Liturgy as a type of preparation for the celebration of the mystery. And in the Liturgy that is celebrated by a priest, the censing is done after the proskomidē and before the enarxis of the Divine Liturgy, namely, during the doxology, if the Liturgy is connected with Matins, or during the Sixth Hour in the monasteries, where the Liturgy is celebrated separately from Matins, according to the more ancient taxis, immediately after the reading of the Third and Sixth Hours. Again, we encounter the offering of incense in the hierarchical Liturgy before its enarxis, namely, immediately after the entrance of the hierarch into the bēma at the small

529. Phountoulēs is likely referring to the printing of sermons on the epistle pericopes in advance and their distribution to parishes of the Metropolis of Thessaloniki. In a weekly publication entitled, *Voice of the Lord, (Φωνὴ Κυρίου)*, Apostolikē Diakonia similarly provides printed sermons up until the present. In the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America, a similar practice occurs in parishes with the reading of encyclicals from hierarchs on major feasts.

530. "Ἐπακούσαι σου Κύριος ἐν ἡμέρᾳ θλίψεως . . .," Ps 19:1.

531. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . ."

entrance, during the chanting of the apolytikia. We noted at the time that in a similar manner for the same reason, incense is also offered before the enarxis of the mysteries, for example, holy baptism, marriage, unction, and so forth.

Precisely as the preparation for the celebration of services, we also encounter an offering of incense in the service of Matins, to which the questions above refer. The old-time priests maintained this practice, just as they had been taught by those even older, who again "by inheritance," so to speak, preserved for us the correct ancient practice in question. This is also done nowadays on the Holy Mountain. In order for us to be better informed, it is necessary for us to trace back the historical development of this element of the service of Matins. Matins formerly began from the blessing of the enarxis, "Glory to the holy and consubstantial . . .,"[532] or even directly from the Six Psalms, just as also takes place nowadays in all-night vigils. The trisagion of the enarxis was not said because Matins was celebrated consecutively to the Midnight Office. During this period, this censing took place before the blessing of the enarxis, as soon as the fathers (because the service of Matins is monastic) entered from the narthēx—where the Midnight Office was celebrated and is celebrated up until nowadays on the Holy Mountain—into the nave where the service of Matins would be celebrated. Precisely this manner of censing was preserved according to the taxis of the all-night vigil in the service of Great Vespers, during which the priest censes before the enarxis of the service. A little later in time, the censing was done during the chanting of the Six Psalms.

The manuscripts preserve this old practice for us, as for example, a Typikon from the sixteenth century that is found in the library of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem under number 311. Under the title, "Exposition in summary of the ecclesiastical diataxis of the monasteries of Saint Sabas in Jerusalem," it gives the following description of the enarxis for the service of Matins: " . . .when the lamplighter goes out to sound the great sēmantron, the priest after making the customary prostration to the presider,[533] enters and, taking the

532. "Δόξα τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ ὁμοουσίῳ . . ."

533. See question 302, for a discussion of the "presider" (προεστώς).

censer, stands facing front with hands upraised and, when the lamplighter finishes the sēmantron, the priest begins saying, 'Glory to the holy . . ..' . . .and tracing a cross with the censer before the holy doors . . . and while the priest censes, they chant the Six Psalms in a quiet voice . . . after censing all, the priest . . .." During the service of the Resurrection on the night of Pascha and by extension in a similar manner at the enarxis of the service of Matins during Renewal Week, we have a survival of precisely this practice. The offering of incense is done at "Glory to the holy . . ."[534] and during "Christ is risen . . .,"[535] which replaces the Six Psalms.

During the "ferial"[536] days of Great Lent, namely, during the days of the week outside of Saturday and Sunday, Matins began with a trisagion. The censing of the temple took place at that time during the chanting of the trisagion, as also again certain manuscripts describe for us, such as, for example, *Sinai 1094* from the twelfth–thirteenth century: "[The priest] enters the holy bēma and taking the censer, stands before the holy table and censing in a crosswise manner says, 'Blessed is our God always.' And after we respond, 'Amen,' the trisagion is chanted . . . after the 'Our Father,' the priest exclaims, 'For yours is the kingdom.' And after the 'Amen,' 'Lord have mercy' twelve times and immediately, 'Glory to God in the highest' without prostrations, then the Six Psalms." Symeōn of Thessaloniki attests to the offering of incense during the trisagion that preceded Matins and also gives us the meaning of this practice: "The doors of the temple are opened as heaven and as we enter from earth into heaven just as also indeed at that time those who are Christ's will be snatched up in the clouds . . . And the incense is like a cloud, representing the Holy Spirit, but also the transmission of his divine grace and sweet fragrance . . . the priest blesses from the altar . . . and all sing the trisagion . . . The priest censes the altar, the temple, and everyone, since everything is sanctified, honoring the former[537]

534. "Δόξα τῇ ἁγίᾳ . . ."
535. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη . . ."
536. "λιτές." These are ordinary weekdays of Great Lent.
537. Namely, the altar and temple.

as divine, and sanctifying those present.[538] And for which reason, beginning from the holy of holies, of the altar, he censes everything according to order, not simply censing, but sealing, sanctifying, offering by a prayer dedicated to Christ, and seeking that [the incense] be received above and that the grace of the All-holy Spirit be sent down to us; so that we receive grace through the incense; and let no one neglect the censing. Therefore, after quickly passing through the entire temple and outside, about the end of the prayer of the 'Our Father,' he enters the doors and tracing the cross with the censer says, 'For yours is the kingdom . . .,' sealing the prayer, as Christ said, and glorifying the Trinity. Then he censes the abbot a second time, giving honor as to Christ, and likewise the sacred icons in the middle and entering the sanctuary, standing before the holy table . . . he exclaims with reverence and longing, 'Glory to the holy . . .'" (*Dialogue*, chapter 309).[539] Apart from other things from the testimony of Symeōn, it is worth us paying attention to, "let no one neglect the censing," which means that in his times there were also those "careless about censing," just as even nowadays.

In the imperial Byzantine monasteries, a prayer for the emperor was introduced at the beginning of Matins that included two royal psalms, the nineteenth, "May the Lord hearken to you in affliction's day . . . ," and the twentieth, "O Lord, in your power . . ., "[540] a trisagion, three royal troparia, ("O Lord, save . . . ,"[541] "May He who voluntarily was raised on the Cross . . .,"[542] and "Awesome protection . . ."[543]), and an ektenēs for the emperor that concluded with the exclamation, "For you are a merciful God who loves humankind . . . ."[544] The service for the emperor was also introduced later in the non-imperial monasteries, in the printed Hōrologia, and in the parish temples, where, as it is well known, it is chanted during

538. The text here, "τοὺς δὲ παρεστῶτας ἁγιάζων," differs from that in PG 155:564d, "τοὺς παρεστῶτας δὲ ἁγιάζων."
539. PG 155:561d, 564d–565b.
540. "Κύριε, ἐν τῇ δυνάμει σου . . ."
541. "Σῶσον Κύριε τὸν λαόν σου . . ."
542. "Ὁ ὑψωθεὶς ἐν τῷ Σταυρῷ ἑκουσίως . . ."
543. "Προστασία φοβερά . . ."
544. "Ὅτι ἐλεήμων καὶ φιλάνθρωπος . . ."

the period of Great Lent, or at least only during the first days of Great Week. This preparatory offering of incense was done at this point during the service, which originally was done before the service and later, as we saw, at the beginning of the Six Psalms or during the enarxis trisagion. The rubrics of all the later manuscript and printed Typika refer to this, as well as the testimony of Markos Eugenikos, who also very beautifully comments on it, "we sing some of the psalms that are for the emperor and the common condition[545] ["May the Lord hearken to you in affliction's day . . ." and "O Lord, in your power . . ."], and in the course of which the priest censes, signifying the imparting of the Holy Spirit at the time of prayer to those who enter the temple. For it says, 'Offer incenses for the prayers of the saints'" (*Explanation of the Church's Daily Office,* Concerning Matins).[546]

In the "Explanation regarding when the priest must cense," which exists in some manuscript Typika, we find the rubric: "The priest censes . . . at the beginning of Matins" (*Vatopediou 320*) or "when the psalms and the trisagion for the emperors are being chanted" (*Pantokratoros 599*).

This censing is preserved even nowadays in the parish temples when the royal service is chanted in Lent. However, when it is not chanted on the remaining days of the year (the three troparia and the ektenēs remained as a remnant of it, which no longer refer to the emperor, but to the archbishop), the censing is also omitted,

545. "τῆς κοινῆς καταστάσεως."

546. Saint Markos Eugenikos, *Ἐξήγησις ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας (Explanation of the Church's Daily Office),* PG 160:1176c. The quotation is perhaps a rubric or instruction that is alluding to Revelation 5:8, 8:3–4. Saint Markos Eugenikos (Μάρκος ὁ Εὐγενικός), (ca. 1392–1445), Metropolitan of Ephesos (r. 1437–1445), became the chief theological spokesman for the Orthodox legation at the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–1439), where he refused to sign the decree of union with the Roman Catholics. He is the author of an extensive number of theological, polemical, exegetical, liturgical, and spiritual works, as well as letters, most of which remain unedited and scattered in manuscripts. This brief overview is based on the extensive study, Nicholas Constas, "Mark Eugenikos," in *La Théologie Byzantine et Sa Tradition,* ed. Camello Giuseppe Conticello and Vassa Conticello (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2002), 2:411–475.

obviously out of misunderstanding. The offering of incense is not connected with the royal service, but with the enarxis of Matins. Consequently, it was wrongly dragged away together with it.[547]

Incense was offered as a preparation for the services of the Byzantine parish or "asmatic" Matins and Vespers, as Symeōn of Thessaloniki attests. However, in his era, the preparatory offering of incense had fallen into disuse and was preserved only in the Divine Liturgy and in the monastic Great Vespers. The text of Symeōn is very interesting for associations with biblical events that it makes and for the theological meaning that it gives to this practice: "At Vespers, formerly it was the custom for the servants[548] to fill the temple with incense before the service, to the glory of God and as a type of the divine glory of God, which once filled the tabernacle, and Moses and Aaron could not enter into the tabernacle, until it lifted. In like manner also in the temple of Solomon, when glory filled the temple, the priests could not stand and serve before the Lord, until that cloud was not visible. And also, in Matins, likewise formerly they filled the temple with smoke from the incense. This does not take place now, except during the Liturgy and only the deacon or priest, after the proskomidē in a type of that glory, censes the sanctuary in silence, or even the whole temple. This is also done in the monasteries before Great Vespers, when the priest also signifies[549] the divine glory and grace that is bestowed through an angel, and that the house of the Lord is full of glory" (*Dialogue*, chapters 346–347).[550]

547. For related discussions regarding emperors see questions 189 (end of the answer), 225, 256, 396 (where there is a brief reference regarding imperial polychronismoi), 417, and 588.

548. The "servant" (ὑπηρέτης) is a member of a minor order, such as a subdeacon.

549. Aside from "signify" and "seal," the word, "σημαίνω," can be taken to mean "to strike the sēmantron" (σήμαντρον). Generally, in the Typikon of Saint Sabas, the verb is used for striking the sēmantron. However, this is assigned to the lamplighter and not the priest.

550. PG 155:824c–824d.

213

During the memorial services, is it permitted for the three staseis of the amōmos[551] to be chanted, given that these are part of the funeral service?

214

In the Great Euchologion, aside from the funeral services for laity, for priests, for monastics, and for infants, there is also a fifth service entitled, "for men in the world."[552] To whom does this concern?

In the liturgical tradition of our Church, the funeral service presents unimaginably great variety and diversity. From one prayer, which originally constituted almost the entirety of this service, it gradually developed with the contribution of ecclesiastical hymnography into a most rich service that is constructed according to the model of the monastic Matins, mixed, especially in the service "for a priest who died,"[553] with elements from the "asmatic" or secular byzantine Matins. In our present Euchologia, only one part of the entire relevant liturgical output is contained, perhaps indeed not the greater part. In the manuscripts, aside from the five services that the second question enumerates, where each one of them presents a multitude of variations, there also exist special services, or elements alternating as the case may be, such as prayers, stichēra, and so forth, "in the case of a hieromonk who died,"[554] "in the case of a deacon who died,"[555] "for an abbot,"[556] "in the case of a nun who died,"[557] "for hierarchs,"[558] and finally "for women who fell asleep."[559]

---

551. Psalm 118.
552. "εἰς κοσμικοὺς ἄνδρας." Namely, "laymen" or "male laity."
553. "εἰς ἱερέα τελευτήσαντα."
554. "ἐπὶ τελευτήσαντος ἱερομονάχου"
555. "ἐπὶ τελευτήσαντος διακόνου."
556. "εἰς ἡγούμενον."
557. "ἐπὶ τελευτησάσης μοναχῆς."
558. "εἰς ἀρχιερεῖς."
559. "εἰς κοιμηθείσας γυναῖκας."

The Euchologion juxtaposes the "service"—because this is concerning a complete service "for men in the world"—with this last service "for women who fell asleep." This service is of a different form from the one in use. It begins from Psalm 90 with the ephymnion, "Alleluia"; a funereal canon follows in the plagal of the fourth tone, "O Christ, since you are the life of the living . . ."[560]; a commemoration and the kathisma, "Truly, all is vanity . . .,"[561] are inserted after the third ode; and the kontakion, "With the saints . . ."[562] with its oikoi are inserted after the sixth ode. Stichēra prosomoia follow in the plagal of second tone, "Having bid farewell to my brothers . . .,"[563] and so forth, which obviously would be chanted at lauds; and the customary ones of the second tone, "Brethren, come, let us give a last kiss . . ."[564] with the doxastikon in the plagal of the second tone, "Looking on me lying voiceless . . .,"[565] follow, which have the position as aposticha of Matins. The "service," or the "canon," "for women who fell asleep" follows precisely the outline of the preceding service, but its individual elements are different. It has a canon of the plagal of the second tone, "Whom do you receive from among us, as a Good Savior . . ."[566]; a kathisma, "In the bosom of Abraham . . .,"[567] after the third ode; a kontakion, "The one exercising authority over the life and death of all . . .,"[568] after the sixth ode; an exaposteilarion, "Now have I taken rest . . ."[569]; stichēra at lauds in the plagal of second tone, "When given life, she who perishes . . .,"[570] and so forth; and the aposticha at the kiss, "Brethren, come, let us give a last kiss . . .." Both services have been published by J. Goar in his *Euchologion*, second edition, Venice, 1730, pp.

560. "Τῶν ζώντων ὑπάρχων, Χριστέ, ζωή . . ."
561. "Ἀληθῶς ματαιότης . . ."
562. "Μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων . . ."
563. "Ἀπηγορευμένος τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου . . ."
564. "Δεῦτε τελευταῖον ἀσπασμόν . . ."
565. "Ὁρῶντές με ἄφωνον . . ."
566. "Ἣν ἐξ ἡμῶν προσελάβου, ὡς ἀγαθός . . ."
567. "Ἐν κόλποις Ἀβραάμ . . ."
568. "Ὁ τῆς ζωῆς τῶν ἁπάντων . . ."
569. "Νῦν ἀνεπαυσάμην . . ."
570. "Ζωοποιηθεῖσα ἡ ἐφθαρμένη . . ."

468–474.[571] As we wrote, the first one also exists in our Church's Great Euchologion in use. As is evident at many points of the Euchologion, its publication took place without critical oversight and many times we find elements from various liturgical traditions concurrently published in it, just as the first publishers found them in various manuscripts. Thus, also in the present case, we have in it two funeral services "for men in the world"—the one in use and the other concerning which we made mention—which come from different places and times.

Nowadays, as it is well known, we have descended from all this liturgical wealth into a liturgical poverty. Not only are the services of the manuscripts no longer in use, but also those that exist in our Euchologia have fallen into disuse. For all those who have "fallen asleep," the customary funeral service "for men in the world" is celebrated, and which itself is abbreviated to a third of the ancient one that is provided by the Euchologion in use. As far as I know, only in great monasteries, such as on Mount Athos and on Patmos, apart from the monastic, also the service for priests is still preserved in use.

In any case, there was a reaction even earlier against the multiplicity of funeral services. A result of this reaction is the note that we find at the end of the funeral service "for men in the world" in printed Euchologia: "One must know that such a form is also done for women who have 'fallen asleep,' although some spread their own service in a form for women and children, and I have wondered how they forgot to formulate their own service for eunuchs or emperors. Therefore, this service, as it is stated above, is chanted both for Orthodox women and for children, while changing only the name from masculine to feminine, and nothing else." The Typikon of the Great Church of Christ repeats nearly the same thing (G. Violakēs, M. Saliveros, in Athens, 1921, p. 439), which invokes the apostle Paul's teaching concerning equality in Christ ("for you are all one in Christ Jesus"— Gal 3:28): "One must know that this same taxis for the funeral service is chanted for all who have 'fallen asleep,' even

571. Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 468–474.

for kings, patriarchs, hierarchs, priests, and for men and for women, both small and great."[572]

I do not know whether it will be better for us to long for the past wealth or to acquiesce to the current poverty. Both can be justified historically and liturgically. These points concern the second question, which constitutes the presupposition for an answer to the first one.

The prayers for those who have "fallen asleep," the memorial services, also themselves began from one prayer and gradually, in imitation of the funeral services, attained great variety and diversity. In the manuscripts, we have all the phases of this development and the wealth of forms in which they ended up. From the prayers "of the memorial services,"[573] "on behalf of those who have 'fallen asleep,'"[574] "for a basket of grain for those who fell asleep,"[575] "over kolyba for those who have 'fallen asleep,'"[576] or "of incense for those who have 'fallen asleep,'"[577] they arrived at special services "for kolyba of laity who fell asleep,"[578] "for kolyba of a priest,"[579] "for a memorial service of a priest"[580] or "of a hierarch,"[581] "for kolyba"[582] or "for a memorial service of a monk,"[583] or "for a nun."[584] We find the most complete form of the memorial service with quite a few variations in the manuscripts, such as for example in the *Codex Sinai 990* ("Funeral service which is chanted over kolyba") and *Vatopediou 134* ("For a memorial service of a monk. Service over kolyba for a monk"), as well as in the *Memorial Service according to*

572. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 439.
573. "τῶν μνημοσύνων."
574. "ὑπὲρ τῶν κεκομημένων."
575. "εἰς κανίσκιον κουκίων κοιμηθέντων."
576. "ἐπὶ κολύβων εἰς κοιμηθέντας."
577. "θυμιάματος εἰς κεκοιμημένους."
578. "εἰς κόλυβα κοιμηθέντων κοσμικῶν."
579. "εἰς κόλυβα ἱερέως."
580. "εἰς μνημόσυνον ἱερέως."
581. "ἀρχιερέως."
582. "εἰς κόλυβα."
583. "εἰς μνημόσυνον μοναχοῦ."
584. "εἰς μονάζουσαν."

the taxis of the Holy Mountain, which was published in Athens, in 1889, by the hieromonk Sabbas.[585] And this service, as does the funeral service, follows nearly the order for the monastic Matins with a mixture of elements from the "asmatic" Pannychis. It includes Psalm 90, "He who lives by the help of the Most High . . ."[586]; the "Alleluia" with funereal verses; the troparia, "You who with profound wisdom . . . ,"[587] and so forth; the amōmos in two staseis; the funereal evlogētaria; the kathismata, "Grant rest, O our Savior . . ."[588]; Psalm 50; a canon with kathismata after the third ode; the kontakion, "With the saints . . ."[589] after the sixth ode; trisagion; the troparia, "Among the spirits of the righteous . . . ,"[590] and so forth; the funereal ektenēs; the prayer, "O God of spirits and of all flesh . . ."[591]; and the dismissal. It appears that the canon and some troparia alternated according to case. Thus, for men in the world, the funereal canon of Saturday was said in the plagal of fourth tone, "All the martyrs imitating Christ's death by their death . . ."[592]; the same one, or the one in the plagal of second tone, "In celestial bridal chambers, the noble choirs of the martyrs ceaselessly . . . ,"[593] was said for monks; "O Master all-merciful . . ."[594] for nuns; and the canon, "Let us sing a funeral song to the only immortal one . . . ,"[595] for priests, and so on.

585. *Ἀκολουθία τοῦ μνημοσύνου κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὄρους ἐκδίδοται τὸ πρῶτον δαπάνῃ Σάββα, ἱερομονάχου ἐκ τοῦ Ἰβηριτικοῦ κελλίου τῶν ἁγίων ἀναργύρων, πλησίον τοῦ Πρωτάτου* (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1889).

586. "Ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν βοηθείᾳ τοῦ Ὑψίστου . . ."

587. "Ὁ βάθει σοφίας . . ."

588. "Ἀνάπαυσον, Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν . . ."

589. "Μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων . . ."

590. "Μετὰ πνευμάτων δικαίων . . ."

591. "Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός . . ."

592. "Θανάτῳ τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Χριστοῦ . . ."

593. "Ἐν οὐρανίοις θαλάμοις διηνεκῶς . . ."

594. "Δέσποτα πανοικτιρμον . . ."

595. "Ὠδὴν ἐπιτάφιον ᾄσωμεν τῷ μόνῳ ἀθανάτῳ . . ."

The memorial supplication celebrated nowadays is an abridgment of this great memorial service or vigil. It is usually found in two forms, the extended and the more abbreviated. In the first form, it includes the amōmos (namely, selected verses), the funereal evlogētaria (again not all), the kontakion "With the saints . . . ," the trisagion (which usually is omitted), the troparia "Among the spirits of the righteous . . . ," the synaptē, the prayer, and the dismissal. In the second one, it includes the trisagion (which is often omitted), the troparia, the synaptē, and the prayer. As is well known, there also exist more or less abbreviated forms in practice: sometimes the amōmos is omitted, at other times the amōmos and the evlogētaria are omitted, and at others the troparia are also omitted and only the last one, "The only pure . . . ,"[596] is retained. What is liturgically correct in all these cases is difficult to say. The old liturgical form, as we described it above, was not possible to be retained in use because of its length, especially in parish temples. The funereal Trisagion, which contains (apart from the trisagion and the troparia, "Among the spirits of the righteous . . .") the synaptē and the prayer, is one element that one way or another must be preserved as it is. Moreover, its celebration does not exceed reasonable time limits. The evlogētaria cannot strictly be understood without the chanting of the amōmos, of which they are stichēra. However, in the parish form of our present-day services, there exist such examples in the Matins of Saturdays and Sundays, during which the amōmos is omitted, but the evlogētaria are chanted. I think that it would be more correct to preserve both the amōmos and the evlogētaria in the memorial services. Moreover, from the point of view of content and of melody, both are beautiful and very suitable for the occasion.

596. "Ἡ μόνη ἁγνή . . ."

In the case of memorial services, the bad thing is not so much in abbreviations that are done to the memorial service, which, as we said, were unavoidable because of its length, as much as in the biased manner with which they are taking place. It is no secret that the length of the memorial services depends on the social status of the departed or his/her relatives. If he or she is "one with a golden ring on the finger,"[597] the amōmos and the evlogētaria would be chanted. If poor, the troparion, "The only pure . . .," is said rapidly. These matters are unacceptable for our religion. "But if you show partiality, you commit sin, and are convicted by the law as transgressors," according to Saint Iakōvos, the Brother of God (James [Iakōvos] 2:9).

The second liturgically reprehensible thing is the insertion of the amōmos into the Divine Liturgy of Sundays instead of the koinōnikon, when the celebration of a memorial service is about to follow. Sunday is a day of Resurrection and joy. The memorial services are celebrated on it according to oikonomia because it is not possible for the faithful to come to the temples on the other working days. Corrupting the resurrectional Liturgy of Sunday with the insertion of funereal hymns is not permitted. However, we shall also return again to the subject in a more extensive manner.[598]

215

In the case of a funeral for small infants[599] of one–seven years of age, is it permitted for priests to read the usual funeral service, as some do?

---

597. "χρυσοδακτύλιος." In other words, one who is wealthy.

598. See the previous question 147 regarding memorial services on Sundays.

599. The word, "νήπιον, τό," which is translated "infant," does not necessarily mean a child of less than one, but has a range of meanings, including children one–seven years of age as in the case of the questioner, or in some of the manuscripts that Phountoulēs references less than three years of age. There is a wide variation of use locally in Greece. Other words for children, such as "μωρό, τό," also have a wide variation in meaning with regard to age (baby or child).

216

Is the celebration of a memorial with kolyba permitted for infants, and what service is read in this case?

It is well known that in our Euchologia there exists a special funeral service for infants. This is also found in the manuscripts in many and diverse variations, corresponding to those we saw in the common funeral service, about which we extensively discussed in the previous answer. In the oldest manuscripts, we encounter only the prayer "in the case of death" or "a falling asleep of an infant," which is none other than the well-known prayer, "O Lord, who watches over infants . . ."[600] from our Euchologia (*Codex Paris [Coislin] 213* from the year 1027 and *Sinai 966* from the thirteenth century). However, gradually, even this service developed according to the model of the common funeral service and took on the dimensions and form of a Matins service. Thus, we encounter special funeral services in later manuscripts, "for infants of three years of age and younger,"[601] "in the case of an infant who died,"[602] "for an infant who has died,"[603] "for infants who died,"[604] "canon for infants,"[605] "a funeral service for infants"[606] or "a funereal canon for infants who died,"[607] just as these are titled in the Euchologion.

In the manuscripts, as we said, many variations present themselves. However, from all these, we can perceive the effort of the editors of these services, which leans towards fashioning a service of such a type so that there does not exist something in it that does not especially correspond to its subject. All, or almost all, the troparia, which speak of pardon for sins, are replaced with others more suitable. In our Euchologia, the service is incomplete, because

600. "Ὁ φυλάσσων τὰ νήπια, Κύριε . . ."
601. "εἰς νήπια ἀπὸ τριετοῦς καὶ κατωτέρω"
602. " ἐπὶ τελευτήσαντος νηπίου "
603. " εἰς νήπιον τεθνηκός."
604. "εἰς νήπια τελευτήσαντα."
605. "κανὼν τῶν νηπίων."
606. "ἀναπαυσιματάριον τῶν νηπίων." Literally, the "service of repose for infants."
607. "κανὼν ἀναπαύσιμος εἰς νήπια τελευτήσαντα." Again, literally, "a canon of repose for infants who died."

contained in it are the moveable hymnological elements alone that are proper to it. The canon, "O Word of God, who became poor in the flesh . . ."[608] of the plagal of the fourth tone has been placed in substitution of, "In celestial bridal chambers, the noble choir of the martyrs ceaselessly . . . ,"[609] of the plagal of second tone of the ordinary funeral service. The exaposteilarion, "Now have I taken rest . . . ,"[610] comes from the service for "women who fell asleep," which is not contained in our Euchologia. The stichēra of lauds, "O who will not lament, my child . . . ,"[611] and so forth, of the plagal of fourth tone replaces the funereal idiomela of the Damascene[612] or the corresponding troparia for lauds of the funeral service "for men in the world."[613] The service of our Euchologia is in need of supplementation. From the manuscripts, we see that it included the amōmos;[614] the evlogētaria; Psalm 50; the canon with the kontakion after the sixth ode, "Among the saints . . . ,"[615] and the special oikoi for infants, "No one is more compassionate than a father . . . ,"[616] "For often before the tomb . . .,"[617] "Although it became better for you . . . ,"[618] "O Mother, do not weigh me down with tears . . ." and "O Panagia Virgin Bride of God . . ."; the exaposteilarion; lauds with the stichēra of the printed edition;[619] the Beatitudes with special stichēra; a special epistle and gospel reading (1 Cor 15:39–47 and Mark 10:13–16); the funereal ektenēs; special aposticha for the kiss; synaptē with the prayer, "O Lord, who watches over infants . . . ," the trisagion; the troparia "Among the spirits . . . ," and so forth; the funereal ektenēs; and the prayer, "O God of spirits and of all

608. "Ὁ σαρκὶ πτωχεύσας, Λόγε Θεοῦ . . ."
609. "Ἐν οὐρανίοις θαλάμοις διηνεκῶς . . ."
610. "Νῦν ἀνεπαυσάμην . . ."
611. "Ὦ τίς μὴ θρηνήσῃ, τέκνον μου . . ."
612. Saint Iōannēs of Damascus (ca. 650 or ca. 675–749 or 753/4).
613. "εἰς κοσμικοὺς ἄνδρας."
614. Psalm 118.
615. "Μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων . . ."
616. "Οὐδὲν ἐστὶν πατρὸς συμπαθέστερον . . ." In other sources, "mother" appears for "father," "Οὐδὲν ἐστὶν μητρὸς συμπαθέστερον . . . ."
617. "Πολλάκις γὰρ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ μνήματος . . ."
618. "Εἰ καὶ σοῦ τὸ συμφέρον ἐγένετο . . ."
619. This refers to the printed edition of the Euchologion.

flesh . . .."[620] These things are according to the *Codex Sinai 985* from the sixteenth century, which presents the most complete service of the known manuscripts.

Both the canon and all the special troparia; the prayer; and the readings of the funeral service "for infants who died" usually refer, as we have said, specifically to infants, while the troparia of the common funeral service are not suitable to this subject. Therefore, it would be inappropriate for the ordinary service to be also used for them. Besides, the service for infants has a splendid hymnography, in which the pain of the parents is not only portrayed in detail and with tenderness, but also the blessed hope and joy for the addition of a pure member to the Church of the first-born ones, as well as confidence in and abandonment to the unsearchable designs of the compassionate God. The special prayer is indeed masterful in its simplicity: "O Lord, who watches over infants in this present life, in the coming life on account of simplicity of mind and innocence, receive in peace also the soul of your servant [name] to fill the bosom of Abraham and to dwell in radiant places in which the spirits of the righteous live; for you said, of such ones is the kingdom of heaven. For yours alone is the kingdom of the heavens . . .."[621] Seeking pardon for "every sin committed by him in word, deed or thought . . . for there is no man who shall live and shall not sin" and the other similar things of the troparia are entirely inconsistent with the spiritual condition of infants.

The Typikon of the Great Church of Christ (G. Violakēs, M. Saliveros, in Athens, 1921, p. 439) extends the use of the ordinary funeral service "also for these babies for whose service the idiomela according to tone are removed, but the prayer indicated for babies in the Euchologion is said, as well as the gospel reading. 'For all of you

620. "Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός . . ."

621. "Ὁ φυλάσσων τὰ νήπια, Κύριε, ἐν τῷ παρόντι βίῳ, ἐν δὲ τῷ μέλλοντι, διὰ τὸ τῆς γνώμης ἁπλοῦν καὶ ἀνεύθυνον, τοὺς Ἀβραμιαίους κόλπους ἀποπληρῶν καὶ φωτοειδέσι τόποις κατασκηνῶν, ἐν οἷς αὐλίζεται τῶν δικαίων τὰ πνεύματα, πρόσδεξαι ἐν εἰρήνῃ καὶ τοῦ δούλου σου (δεῖνος) τὴν ψυχήν· αὐτὸς γὰρ εἶπας, τῶν τοιούτων εἶναι τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν. Ὅτι σοῦ μόνου ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν . . ."

are one in Christ Jesus' (Gal 3:28)."[622] All priests who also perform the ordinary funeral service for infants follow this rubric. However, let us be permitted to point out that the passage of the apostle Paul about equality is also not suitable to the case of the funeral service for infants. The liturgical tradition of the Church developed a special service because it did not consider the ordinary funeral service proper. And quite correctly.

According to the Euchologion of the *Monastery of Esphigmenou 214*, the service for infants is celebrated "from three years of age and younger." However, according to the modern rubric, this service is performed "from six years of age and younger" (I. Asklanidēs, *A Manual for the funeral Service*, Ermoupolis of Syros, 1875).[623] This second one must also be the most correct.

As for the memorial service, given that it consists of a petition for the remission of sins and the repose of the soul for those who have "fallen asleep," it would not have a reason for existence regarding infants who are spared from the ancestral sin and voluntary sins. The certainty that they repose in the bosom of Abraham is sufficient for the parents. However, in any case, the Trisagion with the usual troparia: "Among the spirits of the righteous . . . ," and so forth, as well as the prayer, "O Lord, who watches over infants, . . . ," could be used for a memorial supplication. As for the kolyba, given that they symbolize the resurrection of the dead, they could not be considered rejected from this memorial service.

217

Is the celebration of a Trisagion permitted before the Divine Liturgy for a person who died during the night?

---

622. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 439. The word, "βρέφος," used here is translated as "baby."

623. Ἰ. Ἀσκλανίδης, *Ἐγχειρίδιον νεκρωσίμου ἀκολουθίας* (Ἑρμούπολις, Σύρος: n.p., 1875). The bibliographic information could not be confirmed for this source. The author's name appears misspelled and most likely should be Ἀσλανίδης (Aslanidēs).

218

According to custom, a Trisagion is celebrated for someone who has just died. A second Trisagion is celebrated before the funeral service and a third one after the return from the cemetery at the place where he died. Is this correct?[624]

According to the taxis that is provided by our Euchologia, two Trisagia are chanted for those who have "fallen asleep": one in the home, before the removal of the deceased, and another at the grave, after the placement of the remains and before their covering. The other ones that are mentioned in the questions are done consistent with local customs. Inasmuch as the Trisagion is a prayer for the repose of the soul of the one who has "fallen asleep," nothing impedes its celebration also at other times, apart from those designated by the Typikon, before or after the funeral service. For example, in funerals of priests or hierarchs, it is well known that many Trisagia are read by each one of the arriving priests or hierarchs, indiscriminately of time and regardless to the two Trisagia formally prescribed by the taxis of the funeral service.

From a pastoral point of view, the Trisagion that is done in the home of the one who has "fallen asleep" after his or her burial has a special importance, which is usually combined with the funeral meal or the "makaria"[625] that is done according to age-old custom. This survived in many regions, especially the agrarian ones, of our

624. See also question 7 and 458. According to older village customs in Greece, if a person died in the early morning or overnight, the funeral was generally in the afternoon. However, if the death occurred in the afternoon or early evening, the body would be displayed in the home of the deceased until its burial the next morning. The older custom was to bury the deceased within twenty-four hours. For a study of such practices, see Loring M. Danforth, *The Death Rituals of Rural Greece* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1982).

625. The dead are referred to "blessed," namely, "μακαριστός (m.)" or "μακαριστή (f.)" and in more colloquial Greek, "μακαρίτης (m.)" or "μακαρίτισσα (f.)." The funeral service itself refers to the deceased as "ἀξιομακάριστος" (worthily called blessed). The word, "μακαρία," as a popular term for the funeral meal, is derived from such references. In some local areas, a phrase is exchanged between those attending the funeral, "μακαρία ἡ μνήμη τοῦ κεκοιμημένου (m.) or τῆς κεκοιμημένης (f.)" (blessed be the memory of the one who has fallen asleep).

country.[626] This Trisagion is done in a calm atmosphere and could be combined with a special prayer for the consolation of the mourners and a few consoling words of the priest, which will concern the life in Christ after death and the hope of resurrection. Instead of the ordinary funereal prayer, "O God of spirits and all flesh . . .,"[627] which has already been said repeatedly in the funeral service and in the Trisagia, and which concerns only the repose of the one who has "fallen asleep," a special prayer could be introduced that includes an entreaty for the consolation of the mourners. In the manuscripts, even also in the printed Euchologia, there exist special prayers that have fallen into disuse. One such prayer was preserved in our Euchologia, in the funeral service for priests, which is brief, simple, and masterfully composed. We cite it below:

Κύριε τῶν δυνάμεων, ἡ τῶν θλιβομένων παραμυθία καὶ τῶν πενθούντων παράκλησις καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὀλιγοψυχίᾳ ἀντίληψις ὑπάρχων, τοὺς τῷ πένθει τοῦ κοιμηθέντος συνεχομένους, τῇ σῇ εὐσπλαγνίᾳ παραμυθήσας, πᾶν ἄλγος ἐγκείμενον ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν θεράπευσον· καὶ τὸν δοῦλόν σου [τὸν δεῖνα], ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἀναστάσεως ζωῆς αἰωνίου κεκοιμημένον, ἐν κόλποις Ἀβραάμ ἀνάπαυσον. Ὅτι σὺ εἶ ἡ ἀνάστασις, ἡ ζωὴ καὶ ἡ ἀνάπαυσις . . .

O Lord of powers, the comfort of the afflicted and the consolation of those mourning, who is a help of all in desolation of soul, by your compassion console those consumed in mourning for the one "fallen asleep," cure all pain lying in their hearts, and grant rest in the bosom of Abraham to your servant, [name], who has "fallen asleep" in the hope of resurrection of life eternal. For you are the resurrection, the life, and the repose . . .

219

During the interment of the deceased, some priests cast soil and water, others oil, and others wine. Which is the most correct?

According to the rubric of the printed Euchologion, after the placement of the remains in the grave, "the priest, after taking soil with a shovel, casts it in a crosswise manner on the remains, while saying,

626. Greece.
627. "Ὁ Θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός . . ."

'The earth is the Lord's . . .'[628] And after this, he pours a lamp or the censer's ashes on the remains. And thus, they cover the grave as usual . . ." In the manuscripts, various related traditions are observed, which are also continued up until nowadays by priests locally. These are age-old funereal customs, which were received by Christian worship and given new meaning, corresponding with the Christian teaching concerning death and resurrection. The printed text was based on perhaps only one manuscript and thus perpetuated the practice that was prescribed by it, which it must be noted, is neither the most accurate nor the one attested to by most manuscripts.

According to most manuscripts, after the placement of the remains in the grave, which is usually accompanied by the troparion in the plagal of fourth tone, "Oh earth as you open receive the one you fashioned . . .,"[629] which is found in our Euchologia in the funeral service for monks, the priest "pours on the remains a lamp full of water and oil [or only oil], while making the sign of the cross three times" (*Vatopediou 133 [744], 134 [745], Dionysiou 450, Esphigmenou 208, Patriarchate of Jerusalem 375, Hagiou Saba 373 [261], 568, Sinai 977, 978, 980, 981*). And according to other manuscripts, the priest "pours the oil," without prescribing whether it comes from the lamp (*Dionysiou 450*). According to others, "wine and oil" are poured by the priest (*Hagiou Saba 369 [57]*) or "myron, wine, and oil" (*Timiou Staurou Kōnstantinoupoleōs 615 [757]*). The chanting of "Alleluia" three times accompanied the triple crosswise pouring, just as at baptism (*Vatopediou 133, Patriarchate of Jerusalem 375, Hagiou Saba 373, Sinai 977*) or also "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof" (*Vatopediou 133, 134, Dionysiou 450, Esphigmenou 208, Patriarchate of Jerusalem 375, Hagiou Saba 373, Sinai 977, 980*) or "Sprinkle me with hyssop and I shall be made clean"[630] (*Dionysiou 450, Hagiou Saba 369, Timiou Staurou 615*) or "In the name of the

628. Ps 23:1.

629. "Γῆ χανοῦσα ὑπόδεξαι τὸν ἀπὸ σοῦ πλασθέντα, χειρὶ Θεοῦ τὸ πρότερον· πάλιν δὲ ὑποστρέφοντα πρὸς σὲ τὴν τεκοῦσαν· τὸ γὰρ κατ' εἰκόνα ὁ κτίστης προσελάβετο, σύ δὲ ὑπόδεξαι τὸ ἴδιον."

630. Ps 50:7.

Father . . ." (*Hagiou Saba 373*) or the phrase, "Oil of gladness and salvation in the tabernacles of the righteous" (*Hagiou Saba 373*). It is sometimes combined with the troparion, "By the sign of your cross, O Lover of humankind . . ."[631] (*Vatopediou 134, Dionysiou 450, Esphigmenou 208, Hagiou Saba 373, Sinai 978, 981*), with more troparia, or with two or three of the above phrases and troparia.

According to many manuscripts, the priest does not only cast on the remains oil, water, or wine but "with a shovel or hoe" and "soil," or more customarily "clay," also "makes the sign of the cross on the remains" (*Dionysiou 450, Hagiou Saba 373, Sinai 978*). According to other manuscripts, he does not cast oil, and so forth, but only clay or soil (*Patmos 646, Sinai 989*). According to others, the clay was not cast on the remains, but on the grave after the burial of the deceased (*Patmos 646, Sinai 974, 985*). The casting of soil or clay was accompanied, also once again, by passages from holy Scripture or troparia, such as "The earth is the Lord's . . .," "By the sign of your cross . . ." or more customarily the troparion of the Great Canon, "As the potter molds the clay . . ."[632] (*Dionysiou 450, Hagiou Saba 373, Patmos 646, Sinai 974, 978, 985, 989*).

As for the "the censer's ashes," concerning which the printed text speaks, it is not attested to by any of the known manuscripts. In some of them it is stated that the priest "censes the grave in a cross-wise manner" (*Hagiou Saba 568*) or that "he seals the grave with the censer, while so saying, 'This is my [or your] place of rest to the ages of ages . . .'" (*T. Staurou 8*) or "and he censes inside the grave" (*T. Staurou 615*), but in none does it say that "he pours . . . the ash of the censer."

All these things have been presented in detail in order for it to be shown also with this detailed example that our priests while maintaining the one or the other practice are not innovating nor modernizing but keeping local traditions that were preserved for us orally and in writing in the manuscripts, even after the prevalence of printed editions. The diversity, inasmuch as it is based on the

631. "Τῷ τύπῳ τοῦ σταυροῦ σου, φιλάνθρωπε . . ."

632. "Τὸν πηλόν, ὁ κεραμεύς . . ." The troparion comes from the Great Canon of Saint Andrew.

tradition of the Church, must not alarm us, nor must we be ready to disapprove of it in the name of a supposedly uniform worship. Our worship has never been uniform in all things. The manuscripts also demonstrate this, even in the example that we discussed in this answer. Among themselves, only industrial products are exactly the same.

As for the meaning of these liturgical practices, with which our Church bids us farewell at the grave, we cite here the excellent commentary on them by Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki: "And we lower the remains into the grave and consign them to the earth with prayers, while fulfilling the divine command, 'Earth you are, and to earth shall you return.'[633] We also proclaim the Resurrection when sealing the remains by the cross; either pouring oil on them from the lamp in a crosswise manner or casting earth with a vessel; because although we have been born mortal, but nevertheless, we shall be resurrected by the one who was incarnate on our behalf, died in the flesh, rose, and bestowed the resurrection to us. We also proclaim that he who is now being buried shall rise, as also our Savior rose. For which reason also after laying the body in the grave, oil is poured on it in a crosswise manner, just as the apostles have handed down and Dionysios writes this; and much more during the preparations for burial, is it necessary for the deceased to be anointed. For just as there is water and oil in baptism, in a type of the latter it is necessary for these things to be applied piously to those who lived faithfully . . . For the oil is signifying of the struggles. And because one who fell asleep, after struggling well and piously, has been successful and shall be deemed worthy of divine mercy and the splendid gladsomeness of the divine light" (*Dialogue*, chapter 368).[634] Saint Symeōn attests that they also

633. Gen 3:20.

634. PG 155:685d–688a. The word in Greek for oil, "τὸ ἔλαιον," and the word for mercy, "τὸ ἔλεος," are often interchanged poetically. This use of words is not conveyed by the translation of "mercy" and "oil."

casted "soil[635] of the censor" on deceased "in the world"[636] (*Dialogue*, chapter 287).[637]

220

When the feast of Theophany falls on a Sunday or Monday and the eve is Saturday or Sunday, do we fast or not?

221

Is it permitted to drink the Hagiasmos of the eve? If yes, why do we fast in order for us to receive Great Hagiasmos?

We recently wrote concerning the Great Hagiasmos in response to question 208. There, we also referred to previous answers that related to the same subject. The two questions above are both directly or indirectly related to the same topic. The first question because it also moves in the same sphere. In other words, the topic can be framed as follows: We fast on the eve of Theophany. An aim for this fasting is commonly considered the preparation to approach for partaking of the Great Hagiasmos of the day of the feast. However, if the eve is on Saturday or Sunday, consequently a day where fasting is not permitted, then how will we commune of Hagiasmos on the next day? Also, again if the Hagiasmos of the eve and the feast day is the same Great Hagiasmos, and since a presupposition for partaking of it is fasting, are we unable to commune from the Hagiasmos of the eve, given that we did not fast on the preceding day, which is a day for consumption of everything? It is not the first time that the above views are heard and recorded. They are due to a pious misunderstanding that surrounds the service of the Great Hagiasmos and often creates problems both for our priests and our people. Since the answer to these questions presupposes what we wrote on another occasion, it is necessary for the previous related answers to be read parallel with it.

635. The word, "χοῦν," can also be translated, "dust."
636. "κοσμικούς." Namely, the laity in the world versus those in monastic life.
637. PG 155:520d.

The fast of the eve of Theophany is wrongly considered to have a connection with the partaking of Great Hagiasmos. According to an old custom of the Church, preparation came before the great feasts, which apart from other things also included fasting. These fasts were of only a few days—of one, two, or three days—or even a week, which gradually by the influence of the monks grew even more. We have such preparatory fasts for the Nativity, Pascha, the feast of the Holy Apostles, the Transfiguration, and the Dormition of the Theotokos. In individual Typika, we find fasts even before feasts of great saints, such as Saint Dēmētrios, the Archangels, the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, the Beheading of the Forerunner, and so forth. Theophany was not able to develop a fast—even though its forefeast begins from January 2—because the twelve-day period of the Nativity constituted a festal period free from all fasting. Moreover, the fast of the Nativity is also preparatory for Theophany, inasmuch as these feasts formerly constituted one unified feast, which was celebrated on January 6; but even nowadays, their connection is close, and they can be considered as two aspects of one feast. In the Armenian Church, which preserved the old common celebration of the Nativity and Theophany on January 6, a seven-day fast precedes the feast. Therefore, only the eve of Theophany has remained as a day of fasting, of xerophagy, in our Church. For this reason, also, the Liturgy of the eve of Basileios the Great is combined with Vespers. Namely, it was originally celebrated in the evening after the Ninth Hour, due to the fasting, just as also up until nowadays in the monasteries. Nevertheless, according to the sacred canons, fasting is prohibited on Saturdays and Sundays. If the eve of Theophany coincides on these days, the fast is broken, not indeed completely "for everything," but we have consumption "of wine and oil" and the Divine Liturgy is celebrated, just as on non-fasting days, in the morning. Perhaps the fasting on the eve also has some connection with the baptism of catechumens. It is well known that during Theophany, just also during the Nativity and especially Pascha, catechumens approached *en masse* for baptism. It is likewise well known that

fasting of those being baptized and the whole Church preceded the baptism.

The fact that the fast does not relate to the partaking of Great Hagiasmos can also be concluded from the parallel of the preparation for holy communion. As we wrote on another occasion, the three-day fast is a modern custom.[638] During the period when the fast of the eve of Theophany was introduced, and many centuries after this, the preparatory fast for holy communion for the people was also the one observed nowadays by priests, namely, the absolute abstinence from food from the last meal, or from midnight, up until the time of holy communion. It would be absurd for a longer fasting period to be necessitated for partaking of Great Hagiasmos than what is required for partaking of the Lord's Body and Blood.

But this is not only precluded by the case in which the eve of Theophany would coincide with a non-fasting day (Saturday or Sunday), but also by the actual celebration of the Great Hagiasmos during the eve, and indeed according to the modern taxis, in the morning. The preceding day (January 4) is fast-free. Consequently, the Hagiasmos either would not be performed during the eve or if it was performed the faithful should not commune from it. However, the latter is out of the question. All the sacred services are performed in order that the faithful share of spiritual gifts through partaking the sanctified species. In a previous answer, we saw not only relevant witnesses of the standard rubrics from manuscripts, but even relevant phrases from the service itself. The diaconal petitions clearly speak regarding "those who partake" of the water and regarding the sanctification that the faithful will receive "through partaking of these waters by the invisible appearance of the Holy Spirit."[639] The great prayer of consecration and the prayer of inclination clearly mention the same thing regarding "those who partake" and of the "partaking" of the sanctified water by Christians.

638. In Greece, there are various local traditions regarding preparation for receiving holy communion. The three-day fast is the most prevalent.

639. "διὰ τῆς τῶν ὑδάτων τούτων μεταλήψεως τῇ ἀοράτῳ ἐπιφανείᾳ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος."

222

If everything was canonically performed for the mystery of baptism and the newly illumined was not anointed with oil by his or her sponsor, does this practice affect the baptism canonically?

Obviously, the questioner touches on the subject whether the baptism is valid in which an anointing of the one baptized with the oil of exorcism did not occur or did not completely occur, or he/she was not anointed by his or her sponsor but by another person.

In principle, a service of baptism is obviously not celebrated under canonical conditions without the blessing of oil and the anointing of the catechumen with it. The oil of exorcism is a most ancient and indispensable element for the celebration of baptism. The Fathers speak about this such as Saint Kyrillos of Jerusalem, Basileios the Great, Chrysostomos, the Damascene, and many others up until Symeōn of Thessaloniki.

Saint Kyrillos of Jerusalem, when addressing himself to the newly illumined, expounds the meaning of the anointing as follows: By the anointing with the oil of exorcism "you became communicants of the good olive tree, Jesus Christ. For after being cut off from the wild olive tree, you were grafted to the good one and became communicants of the richness of the true olive tree. Therefore, the oil of exorcism was the symbol of communion of the richness of Christ, being that which will banish every trace of hostile influence . . . as not only burning to purify the vestiges of sins but also to chase away the invisible powers of the evil one" (*Catechesis* 20, *Mystagogic Catechesis 2*, 3).[640] But also, according to Saint Iōannēs of Damascus, the oil is

640. Kyrillos of Jerusalem, *Mystagogic Catechesis* 2, 3 in *Cyrille de Jérusalem, Catéchèses Mystagogiques*, ed. Auguste Piédagnel and trans. Pierre Paris, SC 126 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966), 109. Translation modified from F.L. Cross, *St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Lectures on the Christian Sacraments* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1977), 60. Compare also the translation, " . . .and became sharers in Jesus Christ, the true olive. You were cut from the wild olive and grafted on to the true olive, and began to share in the richness of the genuine olive. So the exorcised oil is a symbol of this share in the richness of Christ and it wards off every trace of enemy power . . . that it can burn away the traces of sin and even repel the hidden powers of the evil one," in Yarnold, *Cyril of Jerusalem*, 172–173. Wild or uncultivated olive trees typically bear small fruit or no fruit at all. When left unattended, olive trees sprout lower branches

a sensible representation of the mercy of God which comes from the Flood of the world of sin in order to save the one who flees to God, as was prefigured by the dove with the "olive branch" in the ark of Noah (*An Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* 4.9).[641] It is what initiates the new fighter "into the spiritual arena" and fortifies his members to become unassailable "to the arrows hurled by the adversary" according to Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos (*Catechesis 2*, 23–24).[642] Or, as Symeōn of Thessaloniki summarizes, "But since the representation of divine mercy must also be present, it is also brought to pass in the holy oil. For while the water signifies both the washing away and purification and is already sanctified, the oil represents divine mercy and the joy of His kindness. It is indeed also provided to those who have been wounded and scourged by the common enemy, as Christ says in the Gospels. This was also represented in the time of Noah; for a dove came to those who were still with the ark on the water, as it carried a branch of an olive tree in its mouth . . . the branch of an olive tree, which it bore in its mouth, was in proof of the mercy and the infinite kindness of God . . . The gladness comes from the Spirit when saving us in a good and cheerful manner . . . he is anointed; for he is completely prepared against the holy struggles. For he did not come forward in order to be fainthearted, but in order for him to imitate Christ, whom he puts on, and both wrestles and fights

---

that prevent the upper ones from bearing fruit. In order to be restored to fruit bearing, lower branches must be removed and the grafting of branches from cultivated trees needs to take place. This practice is ancient and reflected in the text of Saint Kyrillos.

641. PG 94:1125b. The word in Greek for oil, "τὸ ἔλαιον," and the word for mercy, "τὸ ἔλεος," are often interchanged poetically. This use of words is not conveyed by the translation of "mercy" and "oil."

642. "Λοιπὸν γὰρ μάχη καὶ ἀντίστασις ἐξ ἐκείνου πρὸς αὐτὸν γίνεται καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καθάπερ ἀθλητάς τινας Χριστοῦ οὕτω διὰ τῆς ἀλοιφῆς εἰς τὸ στάδιον τὸ πνευματικὸν εἰσάγει. Εἶτα μετὰ τοῦτο κατὰ τὸν τῆς νυκτὸς καιρὸν ὁλόκληρον ἀποδύσας τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ καθάπερ εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰσάγειν μέλλων διὰ τῶν τελουμένων οὕτως ἅπαν τὸ σῶμα ἀλείφεσθαι παρασκευάζει τῷ ἐλαίῳ ἐκείνῳ τῷ πνευματικῷ ὥστε πάντα τὰ μέλη διὰ τῆς ἀλοιφῆς τειχισθῆναι καὶ ἀχείρωτα γενέσθαι τοῖς παρὰ τοῦ ἐναντίου πεμπομένοις βέλεσι." Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos, *Baptismal Catechesis 2*, 23–24 in *Huit Catéchèsis Baptismales Inédites*, ed. and trans. Antoine Wenger, SC 50 (Paris: Cerf, 1957), 147.

bravely against the evil. Those who also competed in the flesh were also long ago anointed with oil" (*Dialogue*, chapters 62–63).[643]

Therefore, since this is the significance of the anointing, its omission is not justified for any reason, unless an immediate death of the catechumen is imminent, and the circumstances are such that it is not possible for oil to be found and blessed and for the one baptized to be anointed with it.

Now, as for the second point of the question, namely, if it is indicated that the one baptized was not anointed by the sponsor, but by another person, the following could be noted: The custom prevalent nowadays that the one baptized is anointed by the sponsor is relatively modern. We encounter it only in later manuscripts, from the fifteenth century and afterward. Originally, the deacons anointed the male catechumen, and the deaconesses the female catechumen. This taxis is attested to by many ancient and late manuscripts, such as by the *Codices Barberini 336, Vatopediou 324, Sinai 956, 957, 959, 962, 971, 973, Athens 665, 667, 685, 1910*, and *S. 573*. When a deacon was not present, the priest alone anointed the catechumens, as the works of Dionysios the Areopagite and some codices also attest. But with the passage of time, this rubric fell into disuse because neither deacons existed nor many priests were in attendance, and for the one priest who customarily celebrated the mystery it was not easy for him to anoint the ones baptized alone, especially when they were infants. Thus, the "servants"[644] of the temple (*Symeōn of Thessaloniki, Codex Sinai 968*), the midwife (*T. Staurou 8, 69*), and finally, the sponsor, emerge to assist in the anointing. Reactions were not lacking. For example, in the *Codex Athens S. 696*, we find the following note: "And the priest alone anoints the whole body of the child. Another does not extend his hand to touch anything or to anoint the child with oil or to extend his hand within the baptismal font. Neither does the midwife nor the sponsor dare to anoint with oil, but only the priest . . .." Nevertheless, finally, it became prevalent for the anointing to be done by the sponsor, whose privilege was in some way considered the anointing of the child with the oil

643. PG 155:225c, 228b.
644. "ὑπηρέται."

of exorcism. Consequently if, in the case that the question cites, the child was not anointed by the sponsor, but the older tradition of the Church was observed, this is not a mortal sin, nor does it affect the validity of the mystery.

223

In the dismissals for feasts of the Lord, we say, "Ὁ ἐν σπηλαίῳ . . ." (May He who was born in a cave . . .), "Ὁ ἐν ἀγκάλαις τοῦ δικαίου Συμεών . . ." (May He who deigned to be carried in the arms of the righteous Symeōn . . .)," "Ὁ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν . . ." (May He who rose from the dead . . .) and so forth. In the dismissal for the first three days of Great Week, we say, "Ἐρχόμενος ὁ Κύριος πρὸς [ἢ ἐπὶ] τὸ ἑκούσιον πάθος . . ." (May the Lord who is coming toward [or upon] the voluntary passion . . .). Is it not grammatically more correct for us to say, "Ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς τὸ ἑκούσιον πάθος . . ." (May He who is coming toward the voluntary passion . . .)?[645]

The form of the dismissal for the first three days of Holy Week, "Ἐρχόμενος ὁ Κύριος . . . (May the Lord who is coming . . ."), is not encountered, at least as far as I know, in the manuscripts nor even in many old, printed editions. Originally, it appears that the dismissal for these days was the customary one for non-feast days, "Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . ." (May Christ our true God . . .), namely, no special characteristic of the dismissal for a feast of the Lord was prefixed. The thought of proposing a special phrase was not out of place since the days of Great Week have a character of a feast of the Lord and all the other ones, apart from the first three, had their special characteristic in the dismissal. But even the selection of this

645. The lack of the definite article, "ὁ," before, "ἐρχόμενος" (who is coming), causes a syntactical problem in the entire structure of the phrase. The participle is separated from the subject, "ὁ Κύριος" (the Lord), and this causes confusion with respect to the two verbs that follow, "ἐλεήσαι καὶ σώσαι" (have mercy and save). In addition, the separation of the verb, "ἐρχόμενος," from the preposition, "πρός," is awkward. Nevertheless, the basic meaning of both versions is identical. In a related discussion, Phountoulēs later also addresses the variation in the use of two different prepositions (πρός and ἐπί) in the phrase.

phrase is not unsuccessful, given that the subject of these days precisely is the coming of Christ to the voluntary passion. Grammatically, the correct form would be that which the questioner proposes, which all the dismissals for feasts of the Lord follow: "Ὁ ἐρχόμενος [Κύριος]...πρὸς τὸ ἑκούσιον πάθος ἐλεήσαι καὶ σώσαι ἡμᾶς ὡς ἀγαθὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος" (May he [the Lord] who is coming toward the voluntary passion . . .have mercy and save us as he is good and a lover of humankind). The dismissal, as we previously wrote, is a blessing of the people at the end of the service, which is expressed in an indirect manner customary in the Byzantine form: "Ὁ Χριστός...διὰ τῶν πρεσβειῶν τῶν ἁγίων του...εἴθε νὰ μᾶς ἐλεήση καὶ νὰ μᾶς σώση" (May Christ . . . through the intercessions of his saints . . . have mercy on us and save us). The form, "Ἐρχόμενος ὁ Κύριος . . ." (May the Lord who is coming . . .) certainly cannot succeed syntactically in the whole structure of the phrase. It is clear that it was thus formed under the influence of the first phrase of the well-known idiomelon of the first tone, the first stichēron of lauds for Matins of Great Monday, "Ἐρχόμενος ὁ Κύριος πρὸς τὸ ἑκούσιον πάθος, τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἔλεγεν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ . . ." (When the Lord was coming toward the voluntary passion, he said to the apostles on the way . . .), which is generally referring to the subject of the first days of Great Week. The author is referring to the beginning in the prophecy of the Lord concerning his passion (Matt 20:17–19, Mark 10:32–34, Luke 18:31–33), the word, "Ἐρχόμενος" (Who is coming) obviously is taken from the acclamation during the entrance into Jerusalem, "Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος . . ." (Blessed is he who is coming . . .) (Matt 21:9, Mark 11:10, Luke 19:38, John 12:13). However, the author of the characteristic of the dismissal was not directly inspired by the above passages of holy Scripture, but from the troparion, the appeal of which is evident by reason precisely of the syntactical anomaly that its identical insertion causes at the beginning of the dismissal.

Since we are on the topic, let it likewise be noted that originally the phrase had "ἐπί" (upon) and not "πρός" (towards) his voluntary passion. It is encountered this way in all the printed editions of the Euchologia, Hieratika and Typika, as well as in the *Calendar-Typika*

of the Church of Greece[646] and in the *Taxeis of the Sacred Services* of G. Bekatōros[647] (for example, see the Euchologion of Goar 1730[2],[648] Euchologion of Saliveros 1927,[649] Hieratikon, eds. of Venice 1795, 1875, 1881, Athens 1863, 1892, Rome 1950, Apostolikē Diakonia 1962, Saliveros, and others, *Hierotelestikon* 1948,[650] Archieratikon 1971, and Typika of Kōnstantinos 1838[651] and of Violakēs 1921,[652] *Calendar-Typikon of the Church of Greece*, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1961, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, and the *Taxis of the Sacred Services* 1956, 1957, 1962, 1963, 1964, and so forth). In this form (with the preposition, ἐπί [upon]), it reminds us of the third troparion of the sixth antiphon for the Matins of Great Friday, "Κύριε, ἐπὶ τὸ πάθος τὸ ἑκούσιον παραγενόμενος . . ." (O Lord, when coming upon the voluntary passion . . .." The phrase, "πρὸς τὸ ἑκούσιον πάθος" (towards the voluntary passion) is found only in much newer editions (from as many printed editions as I saw, only in the Hieratikon of Apostolikē Diakonia, eds. of 1951 and 1958, and in the *Taxis* of G. Bekatōros of the year 1970). However, it appears that it was said orally and earlier in this way, from a definite more direct influence of the troparion, "Ἐρχόμενος ὁ Κύριος πρὸς τὸ ἑκούσιον πάθος . . . (O Lord, when coming towards the voluntary passion . . .). At least, I had heard the dismissal in this form from several priests even before the printed editions of the Hieratikon of the years 1951 and 1958. Syntactically, "ἐπί" (upon) and "πρός" (towards) are equally acceptable and give us the same meaning.

646. *Ἡμερολόγιον-Τυπικὸν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* (Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος).

647. Γ. Μπεκατῶρος, *Τάξις τῶν Ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν*.

648. Goar, *Εὐχολόγιον*, 724.

649. Ν. Π. Παπαδόπουλος, ed., *Εὐχολόγιον τὸ Μέγα* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1927), 531.

650. Χρυσόστομος Φιλίππων καὶ Νεαπόλεως, *Ἱεροτελεστικόν* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1948), 271.

651. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὸ ὕφος τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Ἐκ τῆς Τυπογραφίας τῶν Ἀδελφῶν Ἰγνατιαδῶν, 1838), 233.

652. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 355.

The grammatical mistake, which the questioner observes, was also noted by others in the past in the printed edition of the service of Holy Myron that was done in Constantinople during 1912 (*Service for the Preparation and Blessing of Holy Myron*).[653] It is under a syntactically correct form, but which in any case attests to skillful adaptation, "Ο διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν [ἢ ἡμετέραν] σωτηρίαν ἐπὶ τὸ πάθος τὸ ἑκούσιον ἐρχόμενος Χριστός . . ." (May He who for our/ἡμῶν [or our/ἡμετέραν] salvation coming upon [ἐπί] the voluntary passion, Christ . . .).[654] The original full formula appears to be, "Ἐρχόμενος ὁ Κύριος ἐπὶ τὸ ἑκούσιον πάθος διὰ τὴν ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινός . . ." (May the Lord who is coming upon the voluntary passion for our salvation, Christ our true God . . .).

224

At the end of the dismissal, we say, "ὡς ἀγαθὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος καὶ ἐλεήμων Θεός" (as he is good and a lover of humankind and a merciful God) as the liturgical books also record. Some say, "ὡς ἀγαθός, φιλάνθρωπος, καὶ ἐλεήμων Θεός" (as he is good, a lover of humankind, and a merciful God). Is this not preferable, given that grammatically the first "καί" (and) is superfluous?

The dismissal, "Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεός . . ." (May Christ our true God . . .) has been introduced into our services at a later date. It is encountered sporadically in manuscripts from the thirteenth century and systematically from the sixteenth century onward, and in Symeōn of Thessaloniki (*Dialogue*, chapter 323).[655] However, it was much briefer than nowadays. The endless series of saints with double and triple ornamental epithets is an addition of modern times. The dismissal's ending in all the manuscripts is always "ὡς ἀγαθὸς καὶ

653. *Ἀκολουθία τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου μύρου κατασκευῆς καὶ εὐλογίας* (Κωνσταντινούπολις: Ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1912), 8.

654. In the 1912 edition, the word, "ἐρχόμενος" (who is coming), was moved from the beginning to the end of the sentence. Beginning the sentence with "ἐρχόμενος" without a definite article preceding had created the grammatical anomaly that was being corrected.

655. PG 155:588c–588d.

φιλάνθρωπος" (as he is good and a lover of humankind). The clause "καὶ ἐλεήμων Θεός" (and a merciful God) is a later addition. One can encounter the ending without this addition in the codices of *Sinai 1020, Athens 751, 758, 766, 771, 773, 775, 780, 763,* and *767,* as well as in all the old, printed editions and in the present-day practice of the Holy Mountain and the Slavic churches. However even in the modern printed editions, parallel to the newer form with the addition, "καὶ ἐλεήμων Θεός" (and a merciful God), we also encounter the older one. For example, in the newest official edition of the Hieratikon by Apostolikē Diakonia (Athens 1968), the old form is encountered in the Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy (p. 70), in the Liturgy of Basileios the Great (p. 146), in the dismissal for the service of Kneeling of Pentecost (p. 199; the service is presented with another ending at the dismissal, "διὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγαθότητα" [through his own goodness] on p. 237) and in the Trisagion for the dead (p. 204). We find it with the addition, "καὶ ἐλεήμων Θεός" (and a merciful God), in Great Vespers (p. 27), in Matins (p. 53), and in the Liturgy of Chrysostomos (p. 110). It is hardly necessary even for it to be said that this is an example of confusion.

What is the most correct form of the dismissal; with the addition of "καὶ ἐλεήμων Θεός" (and a merciful God), or without it? Without a doubt, the most correct is the oldest form, which has on its behalf not only the tradition of the manuscripts and the old, printed editions, but also the living practice of the Holy Mountain and the Slavic churches. Faithfulness to the liturgical tradition does not only mean that we do not remove whatever does not please us from the liturgical texts, as we commonly think, but also that we do not add whatever pleases us, oftentimes destroying the harmony of the texts with aimless additions.

In fact, this is precisely the case here. The ending of the dismissal is based, obviously, on the phrase of the apostle Paul, "ὅτε δὲ ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία ἐπεφάνη τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ . . .κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς" (when the kindness and love of humankind of God our Savior appeared . . . according to his mercy he saved us) (Titus 3:4–5). It has a symmetrical structure and consists of two verbs in the optative as well as two adjectives. Each verb has its cor-

respondence to an adjective: Christ will have mercy on humans as good and will save them as a lover of humankind. The word, "ἐλεήμων" (merciful), is redundant; moreover, it exists within the word, "ἐλεήσαι" (have mercy). The word, "Θεός" (God) is a repetition because it also exists at the beginning of the dismissal.

The addition also caused the syntactical anomaly, the two "καί" (and) that the questioner points out. In order to smooth out the phrase, "ὡς ἀγαθός, φιλάνθρωπος, καὶ ἐλεήμων Θεός" (as he is good, a lover of humankind, and a merciful God) is oftentimes heard. Let us hope that before this new form is also institutionalized in our liturgical books, we will return to the plain and correct more ancient form: "ὡς ἀγαθὸς καὶ φιλάνθρωπος" (as he is good and a lover of humankind).

225

When the hierarch officiates, why does the deacon exclaim and the chanters chant "Lord, save the pious"[656]? Who does "pious" mean, and how was it established?[657]

"Lord, save the pious" that is said nowadays in the hierarchical Liturgy indeed creates for us the difficulty regarding which pious ones it speaks about. Certainly, the phrase, "Lord, save the emperors,"[658] that follows, gives us the impression that this is about a completely different petition and as a result we must seek the meaning of the former anywhere else except "the emperors."

We will also again find the correct answer in the practice of the Church. As preserved for us in manuscripts that are well known to us and contain the hierarchical Liturgy, the phrase has "the em-

656. "Κύριε, σῶσον τοὺς εὐσεβεῖς."

657. For related discussions, see questions 189 (end of the answer), 212 (end of the answer), 256, 396 (where there is a brief reference regarding imperial polychronismoi), 417, and 588.

658. "Κύριε, σῶσον τοὺς βασιλεῖς." At the time of this writing, Greece was a kingdom and prayers were offered for its royal house during liturgical celebrations. In this case, first, the deacon exclaimed, "Lord save the pious," and then, "Lord, the save the kings."

perors."[659] It was not said after the trisagion, as nowadays, but after the apolytikia, while the hierarch was censing, and before the kontakion. This phrase was the "phēmē"[660] or "euphēmē"[661] of the emperor, which the phēmē of the hierarch or the patriarch followed, or inversely, the phēmē of the hierarch preceded and that of the emperor was said. In the *Codex Hagiou Saba Hierosolymōn 362 (607)* from the fourteenth century: "after the phēmē [of the hierarch] the domestikos[662] exclaims, 'Lord, save the emperors.' And the other, 'And hearken to us.'" According to the codices of the Skētē of Saint Andrew of the Holy Mountain from the fifteenth century, "after these things [namely, after the chanting of the apolytikia] the euphēmē of the holy emperors and that of the one who at that time is bishop. Then the domestikos, if there is one, says from the assigned steps of the ambōn, 'Lord, the emperors.' Then the laosynaktēs[663] says the, 'And hearken to us.'"

Immediately after, the "Glory . . . both now . . ." of the conclusion of the third antiphon and the kontakion were chanted. In the same position, we also find the polychronismos[664] of the emperor and that of the hierarch in the same place, in Symeōn of Thessaloniki: "Then, after the censing, there is the phēmē of both emperors and hierarchs, since Christ, having indeed completed the economy [of salvation] and ascended, established his pious hierarchs and through them faithful emperors," (*Dialogue*, chapter 98).[665] Thus,

---

659. The same word, "βασιλεῖς," can be translated "kings" when referring to the royal house of modern Greece or "emperors" if the Byzantine Empire is being discussed.

660. "φήμη."

661. "εὐφήμη." In the imperial and ecclesiastical context, φήμη has the sense of an acclamation. However, in imperial use, "εὐφήμη" also had the modern sense of a "cheer."

662. In its ecclesiastical usage, the term domestikos (δομέστικος) refers to the officer that headed a specific group, such as chanters and readers, Alexander Kazhdan, "Domestikos," *ODB* 1:646.

663. Most likely, the officer who served directly below the domestikos and had similar responsibilities regarding chanters and readers, J. Darrouzès, *Rescherches sur les ΟΦΙΚΙΑ de l'Église Byzantine*, Archives de l'Orient Chrétien 11 (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Byzantines, 1970), 214–215.

664. The polychronismos is an acclaimed prayer for a long life.

665. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 245 (modified).

the polychronismoi are placed in the framework of the entrance: The hierarch enters the sanctuary, censes, and is acclaimed, in order for him to ascend and be seated upon the synthronon from which he will observe the didactic part of the Divine Liturgy, which the trisagion hymn precedes. According to the codex of *Hagiou Saba*, the polychronismoi were transferred after the trisagion hymn during the ordination of a hierarch, a practice that finally also became prevalent, although it disrupted the unity of the trisagion and readings.

That "Lord, save the emperors" was one of many Byzantine imperial polychronismoi, we can conclude this from *The Book of Ceremonies* of Kōnstantinos Porphyrogennētos,[666] at many points of which, this euphēmē is provided for in the Hippodrome or in other public appearances of the emperor. Indeed, it is even done in almost the same manner that it is also done nowadays in our temples: "The criers recite, 'Lord, save the rulers of the Romans.' And the people call out three times, 'Lord, save!' The criers: 'Lord, save those who have been crowned by you!' The people, three times, 'Lord, save!' The criers, 'Lord, save Orthodox rule.' The people, three times, 'Lord, save!' The criers, 'Lord, save the rulers together with the *augoustai* and those born in the purple.' The people, three times, 'Lord, save!' . . .. The criers, 'May God listen to your people!' The people, three times, 'Lord, save!'" (Chapters 5, 71, 72, 80, 82, and so forth).[667]

---

666. Phountoulēs gives the title in Greek as *Ἔκθεσις τῆς βασιλείου τάξεως*. For a discussion of the title and the work's translation, here modified, see Ann Moffat and Maxeme Tall, trans., *Constantine Porphyrogennetos: The Book of Ceremonies*, Byzantina Australiensia 18 (Boston: Brill, 2012). For a study of the imperial acclamation, see H. J. W. Tillyard, "The Acclamation of Emperors in Byzantine Ritual," *The Annual of the British School in Athens* 18 (1911/1912): 239–260.

667. Phountoulēs appears to have compiled a series of typical acclamations from the various chapters with the exception of chapter 72, which has none. The translation is modified from Moffat and Tall. He also appears to have misquoted the text, "Κύριε, σῶσον ὀρθόδοξον κράτος (O Lord, save Orthodox rule) as "Κύριε, σῶσον ὀρθοδόξων κράτος." For an example of the latter, compare the text in Kōnstantinos Porphyrogennētos, *The Book of Ceremonies* 1.73.

We encounter the phrase, "Lord, save the pious," for the first time in a Codex of the National Library of Athens under number 860 from the eighteenth century. Therefore, it is clear that during the era of the Tourkokratia,[668] for easily understood reasons, the entreaty for the emperor was replaced by the entreaty for the "pious," obviously the Christians, the Orthodox people. Analogous replacements were also done in other petitions, such as in the litany of peace, in the synaptē for the emperor at the beginning of Matins, even in troparia. In all these cases, the word, "emperors," is replaced with the word, "pious" (εὐσεβεῖς), which metrically fits with "emperors" (βασιλεῖς), because "efseveís/pious" also had three syllables and the accent on the ultima.[669] Thus, we have "Lord, save the pious/efseveís" (instead of "emperors/vasileís"]); "grant victory to the pious/efsevési" (instead of "to the emperors/vasiléfsi") in the troparion, "May He who voluntarily was raised up on the Cross . . ."[670]; "For pious and Orthodox Christians" (instead of "For our most pious and God-protected emperors"), and so forth. After the liberation from the Turkish yoke and the restoration of the Kingdom,[671] the entreaty for kings again was also brought back from where it had been removed or replaced. But "pious" had already created a tradition. Thus, in this case, both were preserved, although "pious" does not have a place at this point in the Divine Liturgy, which is nothing other than a remnant of the multiple insertions, opportune or inopportune, in the services of entreaties, or acclamations and polychronismoi for the emperors.[672]

668. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

669. Transliteration given according to Modern Greek pronunciation.

670. "Ὁ ὑψωθεὶς ἐν τῷ Σταυρῷ ἑκουσίως . . ."

671. The Kingdom of modern Greece.

672. Here, the word "αὐτοκρατόρων" which only means "emperors" is used.

226

Before the prayer behind the ambōn, some liturgical books have, "Holy Master, bless,"[673] and some priests bless during, " . . .bless your inheritance."[674] Is this correct?[675]

The final part of our Liturgy that is begun by the dismissal command, "Let us go forth in peace,"[676] has undergone many modifications up until nowadays. We will not analyze the long history of its development, but a few words are necessary for us to precisely understand the presuppositions for the answer to the question above.

Originally the Divine Liturgy, just as also all the other services, ended with an exhortation of a deacon, which was, in some manner, the signal for the faithful's departure, of the synaxis's conclusion, or, to use an ecclesiastical term, "the dismissal."[677] In Byzantine services, this was done with the phrase, "Let us go forth in peace" (or "go forth"[678]); in the Alexandrian Liturgy of Saint Markos, "Go in peace"[679]; in the Jerusalemite Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, "Let us go in the peace of Christ"[680] or "You are dismissed in peace,"[681] and so forth. In a later period, when saying the phrase, "Let us go forth in peace," of the Byzantine Liturgies, the hierarch or the priest also perhaps accompanied the phrase even with a blessing by the hand at the end of the Liturgy, as is also done by some up until nowadays. In a quite early period, at any rate before the eighth century, they

673. "Δέσποτα ἅγιε, εὐλόγησον."

674. " . . . εὐλόγησον τὴν κληρονομίαν σου."

675. For a recent study of the prayer behind the ambōn, see Robert F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Vol. V, The Communion, Thanksgiving, and Concluding Rites*, OCA 281 (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2008), 592–698.

676. "Ἐν εἰρήνῃ προέλθωμεν."

677. "ἀπόλυσις."

678. "προέλθετε."

679. "Πορεύεσθε ἐν εἰρήνῃ." Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 3΄ (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 63; Geoffrey J. Cuming, ed., *The Liturgy of Saint Mark*, OCA 234 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990), 60.

680. "Ἐν εἰρήνῃ Χριστοῦ πορευθῶμεν." B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 126.

681. "Ἀπολύεσθε ἐν εἰρήνῃ."

considered this manner of dismissal insufficient and added a dismissal prayer that was said in the midst of the people, behind the ambōn (which was also found in the midst of the people). This was the prayer "behind the ambōn"[682] which is characterized by Symeōn of Thessaloniki as "a prayer on behalf of the people."[683] The fact that this not only summarized the most basic entreaties, but also had a character of blessing, is seen not only from the parallel of other services that concluded with a prayer of blessing, but also from the content of the prayer itself. "Save your people and bless your inheritance," of the common prayer behind the ambōn also in other cases of our worship is used as an expression of blessing. The priests on the Holy Mountain as well as the old-time parish priests bless the people at this point. This blessing is precisely brought about, just as in other parallel instances in our worship, by the exhortation of the people to the priest, "Holy Father (or, "Master"), bless,"[684] or simply, "Bless,"[685] which also exists in quite a few printed liturgical books. I hold the opinion that this blessing, which is given during the prayer behind the ambōn, was caused not by a misunderstanding, as in the prayer of the Litē or of Matins, concerning which we discussed in the answer to question 202, nor much less by a tendency towards innovation, but on the contrary, it constitutes a survival of a most ancient practice that has its origin in the period where the prayer behind the ambōn was the dismissal prayer of the Liturgy. Perhaps, also, the blessing in, "Save, O God, your people . . .,"[686] of Matins originated from the influence of the blessing that was given at the corresponding phrase in the prayer behind the ambōn. The dismissal prayers that we have in our services are always prayers of inclination. Regarding the prayer behind the ambōn, we do not have any such indication. Neither is it introduced with, "Let us bow our heads to the Lord,"[687] nor also does the content of the various prayers behind the ambōn speak about a bowing of the head or neck. In any

682. "ὀπισθάμβωνος."
683. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 263.
684. "Πάτερ [ἢ 'Δέσποτα'] ἅγιε, εὐλόγησον."
685. "Εὐλόγησον."
686. "Σῶσον ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαόν σου . . ."
687. "Τὰς κεφαλὰς ἡμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ κλίνωμεν."

case, the liturgical tradition gives us a relevant indication: According to the *Diataxis* of Philotheos and many manuscripts, the deacon stood during the recitation of the prayer, "before the holy doors" and had his "head bowed" "up until the completion of the prayer."[688] Likewise, according to *Athens 764*, the priest said the prayer "while slightly inclining the neck."

After the prayer behind the ambōn, the priest did not return to the bēma, but distributed the antidōron while "Blessed be the name of the Lord . . ."[689] was chanted, as well as the "communion" Psalm (33, "I will bless the Lord at all times . . ."[690]) by a transfer from the koinōnikon. This is attested to by many codices, by Nikolaos Kabasilas (*Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, chapter 53), and by Symeōn of Thessaloniki (*Dialogue*, chapter 99). The chanting (a reading nowadays) of Psalm 33 during the distribution of antidōron was preserved in the Liturgy of the Presanctified, and the priest's remaining in the middle of the temple, where he performs the dismissal and distributes antidōron, has been preserved in the present practice of the Holy Mountain.

However, the character of the prayer behind the ambōn as a dismissal gradually fell into disuse and resulted in a need for a new dismissal blessing to be added. "May the blessing and the mercy of the Lord come upon you . . .,"[691] was added as such at first, and subsequently, "May Christ our true God . . .."[692] The blessing by the hand was transferred to these, first to "May the blessing and mercy of the Lord come upon you . . ." and after the introduction of, "May Christ our true God . . .," also during it, and for this reason it is introduced with the command, "Holy Master, bless." And after their introduction, the distribution of the antidōron remained after the prayer behind the ambōn and the chanting of Psalm 33. Later, it was transferred after, "May the blessing and mercy of Lord come upon you . . .," and before, "May Christ our true God . . .." Only

688. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 15.
689. "Εἴη τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου εὐλογημένον . . ."
690. "Εὐλογήσω τὸν Κύριον ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ . . ."
691. "Εὐλογία Κυρίου καὶ ἔλεος ἔλθοι ἐφ' ὑμᾶς . . ."
692. "Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . ."

the verse, "Blessed be the name of the Lord . . ." remained after the prayer behind the ambōn. Psalm 33 was also transferred after "May the blessing and mercy of Lord come upon you . . ." and before "May Christ our True God." Finally, the distribution of the antidōron was transferred after, "May Christ our true God . . .," together with Psalm 33, just as this takes place nowadays in the monasteries and during the Presanctified. When the final sealing verse was introduced, "Through the prayers . . .,"[693] first in the monasteries and later in the parishes, it was said after the distribution of the antidōron and the chanting/reading of Psalm 33, just as in the Liturgy of the Presanctified and on the Holy Mountain, while in the parishes the distribution of the antidōron was transferred after "Through the prayers . . ." and Psalm 33 was omitted. Finally, a new dismissal was also added, but the priest does this by himself after the departure of the people and the removal of his vestments.[694]

In its general outlines, this is the development of the last part of our Liturgy. With all this, I think that it has become clear that from "Let us go forth in peace" we arrived at the developed form of the dismissal, which is comprised of layers of dismissal practices and prayers that were gradually added. This development led to the displacement of the blessing by the hand from the ancient dismissal prayers to the later ones. And that is where the matter finally leads. But the traces of the ancient dismissals and blessings by the hand remained not only in the manuscripts but also in the more conservative practice of the monasteries and of our old-time priests. The blessing during the prayer behind the ambōn and the command, "Holy Master, bless," which precedes, is undoubtedly one such remnant.

693. "Δι' εὐχῶν . . ."

694. This refers to the dismissal that takes place after the consumption of the remaining Holy Elements from the Eucharist and the unvesting.

227

During the procession of the epitaphios in Matins of Great Saturday, when the priest is alone, what must he carry, the Gospel book or the epitaphios or both at the same time? Likewise, also during the aposticha of Vespers of Great Friday. And I ask this because I observed that priests hold only the epitaphios, but later place the Gospel book in the koubouklion and during the procession in the evening leave the Gospel book on the holy table.

The procession of the epitaphios that takes place nowadays at the end of Matins for Great Saturday in imitation of the carrying out and burial of the body of the Lord is relatively modern. In the old manuscript Typika, such a type of procession is not attested to. During the doxology or the "asmatic" trisagion that concludes it, an "entrance with the Gospel book" was done in a simple manner, just as precisely in the ancient "asmatic" Sunday Matins, in order that the eōthinon gospel be read after the end of the doxology. Thus, according to the Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople from the tenth century (*Codices Timiou Staurou 40* and *Patmos 266*), during Matins for Great Saturday, "at the trisagion of 'Glory to God in the highest . . .'[695] an entrance of the patriarch and the priests takes place with the megaleion[696] [namely, the Gospel book] and immediately the chanters ascend the ambōn and say the troparion, second tone, 'O Christ who holds together the ends of the earth . . ..'[697] And after this [the priests] ascend the synthronon and the prayer of

695. "Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ . . ."
696. "τὸ μεγαλεῖον."
697. "Ὁ συνέχων τὰ πέρατα . . ."

the upper throne[698] is done."[699] Other ancient Typika that describe the taxis for Matins of Great Saturday, as it was regionally celebrated by hierarchs and priests, also speak about an entrance, analogous to that which was done by the patriarch in Saint Sophia. For example: "After 'Glory to God in the highest . . .' and 'Glory' and 'now,' the archbishop with the priests enters in an entrance with the Gospel book and then he says the troparion in the second tone, 'O Christ who holds together the ends of the earth . . .'" (*Sinai 9*); "'Glory to God in the highest . . ..' And they enter while this is chanted; then the trisagion, majestically according to the tone. And after the end of the trisagion a troparion is not said, but immediately the deacon says, 'Wisdom,' and 'Psalm of David,' next the prokeimenon" (Typikon of the Evergetis, *Codex Athens 788*).[700] The same taxis was in effect also in Jerusalem even during the twelfth century, as the Typikon of the temple of the Resurrection from the year 1122 describes it for us: "And the chanters immediately the doxology, the patriarch immediately begins with the clergy, they make an entrance into the holy bēma. The patriarch ascends the synthronon and the prayer

698. "ἡ ἄνω καθέδρα." In *Barberini 336*, the prayer is as follows: "Δέσποτα, Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς τῶν Δυνάμεων, σῶσον τὸν λαόν σου καὶ εἰρήνευσον αὐτὸν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος, διὰ τοῦ τύπου τοῦ τιμίου σου Σταυροῦ, τοῦ μονογενοῦς σου Υἱοῦ· μεθ' οὗ εὐλογητός εἶ, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν." Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336*, Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 7.2, 26.2. See the study of Stefano Parenti, "La Preghiera della Cattedra Nell'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336," *Bollentino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* 8 (2011): 149–168; Juan Mateos, *La Célébration de la Parole dans la Liturgie Byzantine*, OCA 191 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1971), 119–122; and the recent translation and updating of the latter work, Juan Mateos and Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *A History of the Liturgy St. John Chrysostom: Volume I The Liturgy of the Word* (Fairfax, VA: Eastern Christian Publications, 2016), 205–208. See also question 367.

699. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:82–83.

700. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 498–499.

of the throne[701] is done and they chant this troparion in the second tone, 'O Christ who holds together the ends of the earth . . ..'"[702]

However, this entrance began gradually to be associated with the procession for the burial of Christ's body. Given that the Matins of Great Saturday was, in some manner, the funeral service of the Lord, the carrying out of the body ought to take place at its end by an analogy to the funeral service of the faithful. The symbolisms especially contributed to the formation of this element of the service. According to patristic interpretation, the Gospel book is the symbol of Christ and the holy table the symbol of his tomb. The entrance with the Gospel book, which as we saw already existed, and its placement on the holy table were not difficult to be considered as symbolic of the carrying out and burial of the Lord. The first thing that is introduced is the troparion, "The noble Joseph . . .,"[703] which refers to the event that they wished to emphasize during this entrance. Thus, in the manuscripts, *Vatican 1877, Sinai 1094* and *1097*, all from the thirteenth century, the entrance takes place after the trisagion and the troparion above is chanted as an eisodikon. It is characteristic that the Gospel book was no longer held by the deacon, but by the priest himself. We also quote the more detailed rubric from the *Codex Vatican 1877*: "When 'Glory to God in the highest . . .' comes to completion, the entrance by the priest takes place, after all his vestments are changed, with both the Gospel book and a deacon preceding with a candlestick,[704] and this is done from the royal gates; and when they say the doxology at the trisagion, then while sealing he enters. Then, after the trisagion, the apolytikion is said, second tone, 'The noble Joseph . . ..'"

The second step took place a little later. The Gospel book was not carried upright in the manner in which it is usually carried in entrances, but rather sideways or on the shoulder of the priest, or,

701. "καθέδρα." In question 367, Phountoulês mentions the title of the prayer as, "Prayer of the throne of the altar" ("Εὐχὴ καθέδρας τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου").

702. Α. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας* (St. Petersburg: B. Κιρσπάουμ, 1894), 2:176.

703. "Ὁ εὐσχήμων Ἰωσήφ . . ."

704. "μετὰ μανουαλίου."

finally, wrapped in the aēr, which symbolized the funeral linens of Christ. The representation of the carrying out and burial takes place in this way more vividly. This second phase of the development of the entrance is precisely preserved in the codices from the fourteenth–sixteenth centuries: *Vatopediou 320 (931), Paris (Coisl.) 215, Vatican (Palat.) 101, Patriarchate of Jerusalem 635, Philotheou 153,* and *Athens 2670.* The manuscripts present some variations, but in general terms the entrance had taken the following form: The priest, after changing with complete priestly vestments, entered during the trisagion of the doxology while carrying the Gospel book "wrapped with the aēr." He held it "not as it is customary," but sideways on the chest or "above his head" and he walked "slowly," while they chanted the trisagion "just as we have the custom to chant at funerals." When he arrived at the royal gates, he stood and awaited the completion of the trisagion. After this, he said, "Wisdom, arise,"[705] and immediately the eisodikon was chanted, "The noble Joseph . . .." The priest placed the Gospel book on his right shoulder and entered through the center aisle into the bēma and placed it on the holy table. The *Codex Athens 2670* also gives us, together with the description, the explanation of this practice: "The priest changes the priestly vestments and enters after wrapping the holy Gospel book with the holy veil up the middle and carrying it upon his right shoulder sideways, in this form suggesting the noble Joseph who in this way bore the life-bearing body of our Lord Jesus Christ and placed it in the tomb. After the third 'Holy,' the priest says 'Wisdom' and says the eisodikon, 'The noble Joseph.' And immediately we chant the troparion of the prophecy."

In the third and final phase that we find in the *Codex Xenophontos 57* from the fifteenth century, we can easily recognize the preliminary stage of the present practice. The epitaphios has been introduced, which tends to displace the Gospel book. The entrance has been transformed into a procession that is done around the temple in order to be developed later into the procession of the epitaphios of our times. At this point, we must remember what we

705. "Σοφία, ὀρθοί."

wrote regarding the transformation of the aër into the epitaphios, its carrying out during the aposticha of Vespers of Great Friday, and its influence on the formation of the great entrance of the Divine Liturgy (answer to question 207). Here is how the codex above describes the new form of the entrance/procession of the epitaphios: "When it is the start of the great doxology, the epitaphios exits from the holy doors preceded by six candlesticks; and the deacons also precede it with censers and vessels, the domestikoi[706] chant, 'Holy God,' and the priests once, slowly; and they exit through the royal gates and go around the church while processing; and when entering inside the temple, they come to the porphyroun[707] and the deacon stands before the epitaphios and makes a cross with the censer, all say 'Wisdom, arise.' And the priests, 'The noble Joseph . . .' up until, 'laid it for burial.'[708] While this is being still said, all enter the bēma

706. More than one "domestikos." In its ecclesiastical usage, the term domestikos (δομέστικος) refers to the officer that headed a specific group, such as chanters and readers, Alexander Kazhdan, "Domestikos," *ODB* 1:646.

707. The term, "τὸ πορφυροῦν," here most likely refers to "τὸ πορφυροῦν ὀμφάλιον," often translated as "the porphyry disc." The word "ὀμφάλιον" (omphalion) describes a round stone plate or disc in the middle of the temple, (LBG, s.v. "ὀμφάλιον, τό"). However, the "πορφυροῦν ὀμφάλιον" is different from that located in the center of the temple and is described as porphyry or purple in color and immediately outside the main entrance of the bēma. In the cathedral of Saint Sophia of Constantinople, the "πορφυροῦν ὀμφάλιον" marked a place where the emperor stood at various times, Εὐγένιος Μ. Ἀντωνιάδης, *Ἔκφρασις τῆς Ἁγίας Σοφίας, ἤτοι μελέτη συνθετικὴ καὶ ἀναλυτικὴ ὑπὸ ἔποψιν ἀρχιτεκτονικήν, ἀρχαιολογικήν, καὶ ἱστορικὴν τοῦ πολυθρυλήτου τεμένους Κωσταντινουπόλεως* (Ἀθῆναι: Τύποις Π. Δ. Σακελλαρίου, 1908), 2:82, 125 (where there is a drawing of its location immediately outside the bēma of Saint Sophia). A picture of the porphyry disc of Saint Sophia is found in Thomas F. Mathews, *The Byzantine Churches of Istanbul, A Photographic Survey* (University Park: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1976), 302. In modern practice, there are often two places marked in the floors of temples, one in the center of the nave and the other in front of the beautiful gate, frequently between the two choirs. These places can be marked by a marble plaque, mosaic, or mat depicting a double-headed eagle. In some monasteries on the Holy Mountain, there are chandeliers positioned over these two places, with the smaller closer to the bēma. Regarding the green marble in the floors of Saint Sophia and the position of the chancel barrier, including plans, see George P. Majeska, "Notes on the Archeology of St. Sophia at Constantinople: The Green Marble Bands on the Floor," *DOP* 32 (1978): 299–308.

708. In other words, the hymn is chanted until the end.

through the holy doors and place the epitaphios on the holy table and immediately the prophecy."

These are the points regarding the historical development of the procession of the epitaphios and the place of the Gospel book during it. The Gospel book is processed together with the epitaphios both during the aposticha of Vespers of Great Friday and during the carrying out of the epitaphios in the Matins of Great Saturday, and together with it is placed on the holy table after the return of the procession. The Gospel book represents the Lord's body and historically we saw that originally it alone "was buried."[709] However, the representation of the dead Christ on the later epitaphios—the original aēr that represented the funeral linen of the Lord and was introduced at first as a wrapping for the Gospel book, namely, as the shroud for Christ's body—is so impressive and so near and close to the psychology of the people that often the attention (not only of the people but even many times of the priests themselves) is concentrated on it and the role of the Gospel book is overlooked. It is perhaps due to this reason that some priests, especially when they are alone and encounter certain technical difficulties in the transport of a Gospel book and the epitaphios simultaneously, prefer, certainly wrongly, to carry the epitaphios and not the Gospel book during these two processions. According to the correct practice, when the priest is alone, he holds the Gospel book on his chest and bears the epitaphios upon his head and shoulders, which has been flung towards the back.[710]

709. "ἐκηδεύετο."

710. "ἐρριμένον πρὸς τὰ νῶτα." "ἐρριμένον" is the perfect passive neuter participle of "ῥίπτω."

228

Must the priest say "Raise the gates"[711] at the return into the temple during the procession of the epitaphios in the evening of Great Friday and what does this symbolize?

In the answer to question eighty-eight, we wrote in detail regarding the combination of the dialogical recitation of the final verses (7–10) of the Twenty-Third Psalm with the return of the procession into the temple after the celebration of the service of the Resurrection during the all-night vigil of Pascha.[712] There we noted that this practice "in some places is associated with the return of the epitaphios during the procession of the Matins of Great Saturday." The question above precisely refers to this point and gives us the occasion to speak specifically about it.

In no manuscript Typikon do we encounter this dialogue being said during the return of the procession of the epitaphios. On the other hand, regarding the service of the Resurrection, we saw many witnesses, both from the manuscripts and from other sources. This absence of witnesses from the liturgical tradition is not strange, since in the previous question we saw how recent the present-day form of the procession of the epitaphios is, and that throughout the whole Byzantine period this was nothing but an ordinary entrance with the Gospel book. When the epitaphios was introduced in a later period, the procession took a vivid popular color; it became a true funeral, so much so that in some places the Church could not keep it completely under its control. The "Epitaphiaka" are still recent, which provoked so much controversy between a bishop and people when the former attempted to curtail certain outrages.[713] An element of

711. "Ἄρατε Πύλας . . ."

712. In the question, the "service of the Resurrection" is being used to mean the rite that is celebrated outside of the temple involving the gospel reading and proclamation of the Resurrection.

713. "Τὰ Ἐπιταφιακά" refers to an incident involving popular abuses in celebrating the procession of the epitaphios. Such unacceptable practices and controversies concerning them are discussed in Κωνσταντῖνος Δ. Καλοκύρης, *Τὰ θεαματικὰ δρῶμενα τοῦ τελετουργικοῦ τῆς μεγάλης ἑβδομάδας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: University Studio Press, 2003).

the embellishment of this procession was the introduction in certain places even of the dialogue before the gates of the temple.

From where did this dialogue originate? Perhaps this concerns the transfer of the corresponding practice from the procession for the Resurrection, in which it was quite old and quite widespread, as it appears from the sources and from its survival up until nowadays in many places. However, perhaps it came from the corresponding practice of the entrances of the Divine Liturgy. In the old Typika, such as in the Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople from the tenth century (*Patmos 266* and *T. Staurou 40*), we encounter the dialogue as an eisodikon in instances mainly of commemorations of dedications (July 9, December 24).[714] The processions stopped at the door of the temple, "Raise the gates . . ." was chanted, and, after the gates of the temple were opened, they entered for the Divine Liturgy to be continued from the trisagion onward. The procession of the epitaphios was originally nothing but an entrance with the Gospel book, such as the small entrance of the Divine Liturgy.

However, the influence of the great entrance is more likely. According to the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of the patriarch Philotheos (fourteenth century)[715] and according to many manuscripts, which date from the sixteenth century onwards (for example, *National Library of Athens 750, 752, 757, 763, 764, 765, 767, 770, 773, 776*), "Raise the gates . . ." was said by the priest or by the deacon during the entrance of the holy gifts from the beautiful gate. It is very likely that verses 7–10 of the Twenty-Third Psalm or even this entire psalm was the ancient psalmic antiphon that was chanted during the great entrance, before it was replaced by the Cherubic hymn. The influences of the Twenty-Third Psalm in the prayer and in the hymns that were especially composed in order to be chanted during the preparation of the gifts ("No one is worthy . . . King of Glory . . . for the heavenly powers . . ."[716]; "Let us who mystically represent the Cherubim . . . so that we may receive the king of

714. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:334–335, 146–147.
715. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 10.
716. Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος . . . βασιλεῦ τῆς δόξης . . . ταῖς ἐπουρανίαις δυνάμεσι.

all . . . by the angelic hosts"[717]; "Now the powers of heaven . . . the King of Glory enters . . . is ushered in"[718]; "Let all mortal flesh keep silence . . . King of kings and Lord of lords . . . the choirs of the angels . . ."[719]), just as also its survival in the Armenian Liturgy and in the manuscripts that we saw above, explains the criticism of the patriarch Eutychios of Constantinople (d. 582), who refers to the phrase, "King [of] glory" that was contained in the "psalmic hymn," which was introduced to be chanted during the entrance of the "not yet perfected" gifts (fragment, *Concerning the Eucharist* 7).[720] We understand how probable this hypothesis is, when indeed it was taken under consideration that the epitaphios was processed during the great entrance in the period outside of Pascha and that the transfer of the dead body of Christ to the tomb was attributed as a major symbolism to this entrance, and for this reason the troparion, "The noble Joseph . . ." is said during the placement of the gifts on the holy table, and that the same entrance troparion was the eisodikon in the procession of Great Saturday.

At any rate, in the case of the use of the dialogue, "Raise the gates . . .," during Great Saturday, as well as during the great entrance of the Divine Liturgy, the influence of the apocryphal *Gospel of Nikodēmos* is clear. This pseudepigraphal text of the fourth century describes in full detail the Descent of Christ into Hades. The dialogue of the final verses of the Twenty-Third Psalm is placed in

---

717. "Οἱ τὰ χερουβὶμ μυστικῶς εἰκονίζοντες καὶ τῇ ζωοποιῷ τριάδι τὸν τρισάγιον ὕμνον προσᾴδοντες πᾶσαν τὴν βιωτικὴν ἀποθώμεθα μέριμναν. Ὡς τὸν βασιλέα τῶν ὅλων ὑποδεξόμενοι ταῖς ἀγγελικαῖς ἀοράτως δορυφορούμενον τάξεσιν. Ἀλληλούϊα. Ἀλληλούϊα. Ἀλληλούϊα."

718. "Νῦν αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σὺν ἡμῖν ἀοράτως λατρεύουσιν· ἰδοὺ γὰρ εἰσπορεύεται ὁ Βασιλεὺς τῆς δόξης. Ἰδοὺ θυσία μυστικὴ τετελειωμένη δορυφορεῖται· πίστει καὶ πόθῳ προσέλθωμεν, ἵνα μέτοχοι ζωῆς αἰωνίου γενώμεθα. Ἀλληλούϊα. Ἀλληλούϊα. Ἀλληλούϊα."

719. "Σιγησάτω πᾶσα σὰρξ βροτεία, καὶ στήτω μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου, καὶ μηδὲν γήϊνον ἐν ἑαυτῇ λογιζέσθω· ὁ γὰρ Βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευόντων, καὶ Κύριος τῶν κυριευόντων, προσέρχεται σφαγιασθῆναι, καὶ δοθῆναι εἰς βρῶσιν τοῖς πιστοῖς· Προηγοῦνται δὲ τούτου, οἱ χοροὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων, μετὰ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας, τὰ πολυόμματα Χερουβὶμ καὶ τὰ ἑξαπτέρυγα Σεραφείμ, τὰς ὄψεις καλύπτοντα καὶ βοῶντα τὸν ὕμνον. Ἀλληλούϊα. Ἀλληλούϊα. Ἀλληλούϊα."

720. Eutychios, *Homily Concerning Pascha and the Holy Eucharist* 7, PG 86:2401a.

the mouth of the Lord or of the angelic powers that accompany him on one hand, and in the mouth of Hades on the other: "A great voice came about speaking like thunder, 'Raise up the gates, O rulers of yours, and be lifted up, everlasting gates and the King of Glory shall enter.' When Hades heard this, he says to Satan, 'Go out, if you are able, and resist him.' Satan then went out. Then Hades says to his demons, 'Secure well and strongly the bronze gates and the iron bars and hold fast my bolts . . . .' Then a voice came again, 'Raise up the gates.' When Hades heard the voice for the second time, he answered as though not knowing, and says, 'Who is this King of Glory?' The angels of the master say, 'The Lord mighty and powerful, the Lord powerful in war.' And immediately with this word, the bronze gates were shattered, and the iron bars were crushed and all the dead who had been bound were released from their bonds and we with them. And the King of Glory entered, as a human being, and all the dark places of Hades were illuminated" (chapter 21).[721] In the Byzantine iconography of the Resurrection and in hymnography, we have characteristic influences of this text. And in the procession of Great Saturday, they wished to represent this so impressive scene of the Descent of the Lord into Hades. Of course, this was done "with the soul"[722] when the Lord died on the cross. But even here before the representation of his tomb, the dialogue was not completely outside of the historical framework of the entire sacred rite. The chanting of the troparion, "When you descended unto death . . .,"[723] which was added to the already existing eisodikon, "The noble Joseph . . .," perhaps also is due to this. The theological difficulty of the matter,

721. Compare the translation in Bart D. Ehrman and Zlatko Pleše, *The Apocryphal Gospels, Texts and Translations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2911), 483. For a critical edition of this apocryphal text, see Rémi Gounelle, *Les recensions byzantines de l'Évangile de Nicodème,* Corpus Christianorum. Series Apochryphorum, Instrumenta, 3 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), 310–311.

722. "μετὰ ψυχῆς." This is a reference to the troparion, "'Εν τάφῳ σωματικῶς, ἐν "Αδῃ δὲ μετὰ ψυχῆς ὡς Θεός, ἐν Παραδείσῳ δὲ μετὰ λῃστοῦ, καὶ ἐν θρόνῳ ὑπῆρχες, Χριστέ, μετὰ Πατρός καὶ Πνεύματος, πάντα πληρῶν ὁ ἀπερίγραπτος" (In the grave bodily, but in Hades with the soul as God, in Paradise with the thief and on the throne with the Father and The Spirit, were you, who fills all things, O Christ the inexpressible).

723. ""Οτε κατῆλθες πρὸς τὸν θάνατον . . ."

namely, that the temple represents heaven and not Hades was not considered insurmountable, since we saw that the same dialogue was also said during the entrance of the precious gifts into the bēma, which certainly represents the celestial.

And we summarize: The dialogue, "Raise up the gates . . .," which is said in some places during the return of the procession of the epitaphios, takes place according to the description of the Descent into Hades from the apocryphal *Gospel of Nikodēmos* in order that this event be presented more graphically. It is not attested to by the liturgical tradition because this custom is very recent. Its traditional place is in the service of the Resurrection and in the great entrance from which it probably came. Based on the above criteria, no one could possibly be in favor of its dissemination.

229

During the Liturgy of the Presanctified, must the transfer of the Holy Bread from the holy table to the prothesis take place during the verse, "in the nights lift up your hands to the holies (τὰ ἅγια)"[724] or earlier?

The questioner refers to an innovative practice that neither is justified by the liturgical tradition, nor does it serve in practical terms the performance of the Presanctified. Namely, while the reader reads the "To the Lord,"[725] in the usual manner, when he arrives at the verse above (Psalm 133:2), he reads slowly and melodiously; the priest then takes the artophorion or the paten with the Holy Bread from the holy table, transfers it to the prothesis, and completes the usual preparation of the Precious Gifts. The connection of this liturgical practice with the verse above is purely peripheral. The author of the

724. "Ἐν νυξὶν ἐπάρατε τὰς χεῖρας ὑμῶν εἰς τὰ ἅγια," (Psalm 133:2). The translation "holies" (τὰ ἅγια) reflects that confusion of the questioner. However, the translation in NETS reads "holy precincts," which is consistent with the answer given by Phountoulēs. See also the discussion of "holies" (τὰ ἅγια) in questions 170 and 600.

725. The eighteenth kathisma (Psalms 119–133) is called the "To the Lord" ("τὰ Πρὸς Κύριον," or "τὰ προσκύρια," according to certain manuscripts) from the beginning phrase "To the Lord I cried when I was being afflicted . . ." ("Πρὸς Κύριον ἐν τῷ θλίβεσθαί με ἐκέκραξα . . .") of Psalm 119.

psalm calls the priests of the Jewish temple who are found in the house of God, to the courts of the Lord, to raise their hands in a posture of prayer toward the holy of holies, the earthly dwelling-place of God, and to glorify Him during the nighttime. From a misinterpretation of the verse, "τὰ ἅγια" were considered the Presanctified Gifts and the entire verse as an exhortation for the priests to perform the work of the proskomidē (here we improperly use the term, "proskomidē" or "prothesis," for signifying the practice of preparing the Precious Gifts, which takes place in the Presanctified). However, such connections of liturgical practices and psalmic verses are not rare in our worship. Specifically, the verse above was used, at least from the fourteenth century, as a verse that during the Divine Liturgy accompanied the lifting up of the holy elements from the prothesis, for the purpose of the great entrance (*Diataxis* of Philotheos,[726] *Codices Athens 749, 751, 752, 757, 763, 765, 766, 770, 773*, and others). Obviously, from there it was introduced in a later period also into the Presanctified.

Nevertheless, in the case in question, regardless of the correctness or not of this association, no witness is given to us from our liturgical tradition that confirms this practice. Indeed, on the contrary, those manuscripts which speak regarding the time of the performance of the prothesis in the Presanctified clearly prescribe that this takes place at the beginning of the stichologia of the eighteenth kathisma ("when we begin the specified stichologia the priest departs to the holy prothesis and taking the Presanctified Bread . . .," *Codices Byzantine Museum of Athens 13, National Library of Athens 662, 750, 769, 1910, Vatopediou 133 [744], Paris 326, Sinai 968*), or vaguely refer to the performance of the proskomidē during the chanting of the kathisma, but without prescribing that this is done during the verse, "In the nights . . ."[727] ("while the kathisma of the psalter is chanted in the customary manner, the priest departs to the holy prothesis and carrying out . . .," *Codices Athens 713, 662*, and others, or "while the 'To the Lord . . .,' are read, the priest does the commixture in the holy prothesis . . .," *Athens 757*). The *Explanation*

726. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 9.
727. "Ἐν ταῖς νυξὶν . . ." (Psalm 133:2).

of the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, which is attributed to Blessed Theodōros the Stoudite, clearly locates the proskomidē at the beginning of the reading of the kathisma: "the reader zealously begins the canon of the anabathmoi, the divine mystagogue himself [the priest] while continually recounting the Fiftieth Psalm sets the Presanctified Bread perfectly in order on the prothesis."[728] Moreover, according to the precise present-day practice that is observed on the Holy Mountain and in nearly all parish temples, the proskomidē is done during the first stasis of the kathisma and not at the end of it.

It should be noted that there also later exists a tendency for the transfer of the proskomidē of the Presanctified, according to the model of the Divine Liturgy, to the beginning and before the enarxis of the service. This is attested to by the codex under number 758 of the National Library of Athens, which places the prothesis before "Blessed is the kingdom . . ."; but it notes that the practice which is observed by "others" is more correct, according to which the proskomidē was done after the enarxis of the Liturgy during the chanting of the kathisma ("others brought out the Holy Bread from the artophorion after he does 'Blessed,' while the 'To the Lord' are said, which is also better").

But also, practically, this innovation not only does not serve a purpose in the celebration of the service, but it creates undesirable complications and difficulties. The taxis of the proskomidē for the Presanctified is simple and ancient, but its solemn performance demands at least a certain amount of time, which the two last verses of the last psalm of the anabathmoi do not offer, no matter how slowly they may be read. The priest must transfer the artophorion to the prothesis, place the Holy Bread on the paten, make the commixture in the holy chalice, cover the Gifts, cense, and return the artophorion to the holy table. All these things can be done comfortably during the chanting of the kathisma and not hurriedly at the end of it.

728. PG 99:1688c. Saint Theodōros the Stoudite (759–826) was a major monastic figure and opponent of iconoclasm, who is attributed many works, including extensive hymnography.

And again, we repeat that our liturgical tradition is so rich that it is not required that we invent ways for us to embellish it. These things create confusion, conflict with our tradition, and in practice most times prove themselves inappropriate and for this reason short-lived. In contrast, traditional elements exist, which for historical reasons have been forgotten and which, when restored to their ancient place, can contribute a great deal to the revitalization of our liturgical practice and life that must be the desired end of our every effort. The answer to the question that follows, which also itself refers to a detail of the celebration of the Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts, will give us such a characteristic example.

230

During the Presanctified, why is the phrase said, "The Light of Christ illumines all,"[729] and why during it does the priest bless the people with the candle and censer?

The phrase, "The Light of Christ illumines all," which is said by the priest between the two readings of the Presanctified, is simple and does not present grammatical difficulties—"The Light of Christ illumines all," (P. Trempelas, *Leitourgikon*, Athens, 1963, 269).[730] But as easy as its meaning is, it is equally difficult to answer the question why it is said and what exactly it refers to. An "outcome" of this difficulty is the various interpretations that have be given by different persons. Some of them are, without doubt, completely arbitrary.

Thus, this blessing is related to the catechumens and certainly to the rank of "phōtizomenoi"[731] or "those who are preparing for illumination," namely, those catechumens who from the middle of Great Lent were preparing to receive holy baptism during the all-night vigil of Pascha. The name, "phōtizomenoi," as well as the phrases of the prayer on their behalf-("O Master, shine your face . . .

729. "Φῶς Χριστοῦ φαίνει πᾶσι."

730. "Τὸ Φῶς Χριστοῦ φωτίζει πάντας," Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Λειτουργικόν* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἀδελφότης θεολόγων "Ὁ Σωτήρ," 1963), 269. Phountoulēs presents the modern Greek translation by Trempelas.

731. "φωτιζόμενοι."

illumine their understanding . . . for you are our illumination")[732] were viewed as reinforcing this position. According to this interpretation, the meaning of this phrase must be: "The light of Christ (or, of the Christian teaching) illumines all (and especially those of the ones present who are preparing for illumination)"—D. Mōraïtēs, *The Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified*, Thessaloniki, 1955, p. 95.[733]

According to another interpretation, the blessing with the lit candle and the phrase, "The light of Christ . . .," is in some sense a substitution for the gospel reading or even a prefiguring of the mystical light that the faithful will enjoy in a few moments during the entrance of the Presanctified Gifts: "For the faithful, this visible light must partially substitute as the light of the word of the gospel, from which they were deprived in these days of weeping, but at the same time it is also a reminder to them of that divine light that not much later they wish to venerate in the Presanctified Gifts" (*Letters concerning the sacred services of the Eastern Orthodox Church*, Athens 1864, p. 42).[734]

With regard to the first interpretation, it must be observed that the relationship of this phrase to the phōtizomenoi is completely peripheral. The catechumens and phōtizomenoi were not the only ones present in the evening synaxis, but also the faithful. Moreover, "The light of Christ . . ." is said in all Presanctifieds, even before Wednesday in Mid-lent Week, days during which the rank of phōtizomenoi was not present, because they had not yet been constituted. But even during the tenth century when for the first time, "The light of Christ . . .," is encountered in the Presanctified (*Patmos 266, T. Staurou 40*), the distinctions of the ranks of catechumens had al-

732. "Ἐπίφανον, δέσποτα, τὸ πρόσωπόν σου . . . καταύγασον αὐτῶν τὴν διάνοιαν . . . ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ φωτισμὸς ἡμῶν."

733. Δημήτριος Ν. Μωραΐτης, *Ἡ Λειτουργία τῶν Προηγιασμένων* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἀριστοτέλειον Πανεπιστήμιον, 1955), 95.

734. *Ἐπιστολαὶ περὶ τῶν Ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας, Συγγραφεῖσαι μὲν Ῥωσσιστὶ καὶ τὸ πέμπτον ἤδη ἐκδοθεῖσαι τῷ 1844 ἔτει ἐν Πετρουπόλει, Μετενεχθεῖσαι δὲ εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διάλεκτον ὑπὸ Θεοδώρου Βαλλιάνου, Συνταγματάρχου τοῦ Μηχανικοῦ τῆς Ἑλλάδας* (Ἀθῆναι, Ἐκ τοῦ Τυπογραφείου Ἑρμοῦ, 1864), 42. This is a reprint of the 1851 version. Phountoulēs substitutes the word "Orthodox" for "Catholic" in the original title.

ready fallen into disuse. The second interpretation is again clearly arbitrary. The phrase, "The light of Christ . . .," is already encountered in the East from the fourth century as an acclamation related to the reception of the evening light without having any special connection to the days of the Fast, or much more to the Presanctified Gifts.

The phrase is more successfully related by others to the readings. In this sense, "illumines all" refers to the sacred authors of the texts of the Old Testament that are read, namely, that these were inspired and illumined by the light of Christ ("The readings from the Old Testament must on the other hand be directly related to the true light of the knowledge of God emanating from Jesus Christ, for them to be interpreted under the evangelical light and that is perhaps why the illumination and seal is inserted between the readings" –D. Mōraïtēs, ibid). In particular, according to Symeōn of Thessaloniki, "The light of Christ . . ." is said between the two readings, after Genesis and before Proverbs, "because Genesis describes the original state, the creation of all that exists, and the fall of Adam. Proverbs enigmatically teaches about the Son of God and advises those who have been adopted just in the same manner as sons and names the Son Himself wisdom and says that He builds a house for it,[735] His All-holy Body . . . and He is the light illumining all things above and below" (*Dialogue*, chapter 354).[736] In any case, even these interpreters somehow justify the position of this phrase at this point in the service of the Presanctified, but do not explain the origin and the true significance of this liturgical form, which itself alone can guide us to the discovery of its historically correct meaning, as well as its precise liturgical purpose.

In the evening service of the Christian Church, the lighting and blessing of the evening light had assumed a ritual character and was combined with blessings, hymns, or acclamations. Basileios the Great attests regarding the ancient hymn, "O Gladsome Light,"[737] which is said by the people during the reception of the evening light:

735. Wisdom.
736. PG 155:657b–657c.
737. "Φῶς ἱλαρόν." For an analysis of this text, see question 562.

"It seemed good to our fathers not to receive the grace of the evening light in silence, but immediately to give thanks when it shines. Who is the father of these words of thanksgiving at the lighting of lamps, we cannot say; the people however utter the ancient expression . . .We praise Father and Son and Holy Spirit of God" (*Treatise concerning the Holy Spirit*, chapter 29).[738] As we wrote above, "The light of Christ illumines all" is an ancient acclamation connected with the lighting and blessing of the evening lights, which was very widespread in the Christian East and already by the fourth century we find it engraved on lamps, entire or abbreviated (ΦΧΦΠ),[739] in Palestine, Cyprus, Egypt, and Asia Minor. We also have analogous cases in the evening services of other liturgical forms, such as that of Spain, where the deacon raising the lit candle said, "In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, light with peace." It is characteristic that in all these blessings of the evening light that a reference always takes place from the sensible light to the noetic, to the light of Christ. In the Presanctified, many ancient elements of the old evening service have been preserved. One of these is also the lighting and blessing of the evening light. A remnant of it is "The light of Christ illumines all." If we follow the development of this practice in the ancient witnesses, we will confirm the correctness of this explanation.

The liturgical manuscripts and Symeōn of Thessaloniki preserve for us certain characteristic features regarding the way the lighting and blessing of the evening light took place in the ancient period during the Liturgy of the Presanctified. During the reading of Genesis, the deacon lit a candle and approached the serving hierarch or priest and said, "Bless, Master, the light."[740] The priest blessed it, saying, "Blessed are you who illumines and sanctifies . . ." (*Codex Sinai 966*) or "For you are our illumination, O Christ our God, always . . ." (Symeōn, *Dialogue*, chapter 354).[741] Then the deacon went out "behind the ambōn" (the ambōn was in the middle of the

738. Saint Basileios the Great, *Treatise concerning the Holy Spirit*, 29.73 in *Basile de Césarée, Traité du Saint-Esprit*, ed. and trans. Benoit Pruche, SC 17bis (Paris: Cerf, 1947), 508–511.

739. Φῶς Χριστοῦ Φαίνει Πᾶσι (The light of Christ illumines all).

740. "Εὐλόγησον, δέσποτα, τὸ φῶς."

741. PG 155:657d.

temple) and there he said, "The light of Christ . . .," "sealing" or "illuminating" the people crosswise with the lamp and censer (*Sinai 971*). According to Symeōn, the deacon exited from the north door of the sanctuary and arrived "at the end of the temple." After the end of Genesis, he appeared "immediately entering the royal gates with the lights, while all stood up," entered, and in the middle of the temple said, "Wisdom arise. The light of Christ . . . ," and afterwards entered the bēma. When a deacon is not concelebrating, these things were done by the priest who, ultimately, obviously for reasons of brevity, said "The light of Christ . . ." from the bēma "facing the holy table" or "outside of the holy doors." This phrase was also precisely the sign for the lighting of the lights in the temple. Symeōn notes, "Accordingly then, the reader is reading Proverbs on the ambōn and the usual lamps are lit in the temple. This signifies that to the end of the ages Jesus Christ shined through the flesh the true light on us who sit in darkness and that he has filled the whole world with the light of his grace." The temple was found in darkness up until this point in the service; "nor are the lights lit until the reading from Proverbs in the Presanctified Liturgy" (*Dialogue*, chapter 352).[742] Even the entrance of Vespers, according to Symeōn, took place "without lights," "which in silence signifying His first coming, while we sat in darkness" (*Dialogue*, chapter 353).[743] The fact that from, "The light of Christ . . . ," the work of the sexton[744] began, appears from some codices, according to which, the reader did not say, "Command,"[745] but the "lamplighter,"[746] in some manner asking permission in order to execute his office. This was precisely also done in the All-holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem during the fourth century, where, according

742. PG 155:653d. A similar practice is observed during Matins in monasteries, especially on Mount Athos, where candles are not lit until the ninth ode when the deacon exclaims, "Τὴν Θεοτόκον καὶ μητέρα τοῦ φωτὸς ἐν ὕμνοις τιμῶντες μεγαλύνωμεν" (The Theotokos and mother of the light let us magnify honoring in hymns). The use of "φῶς" (light), here, becomes a signal to light the candles. Another example is the lighting of candles at Pascha during the proclamation, "Δεῦτε λάβετε φῶς . . ." (Come receive the light . . .).

743. PG 155:656d.

744. "νεωκόρου."

745. "Κέλευσον."

746. "κανδηλάπτης."

to the testimony of the pilgrim, Aetheria, the light during the service of Vespers was not carried into the temple from outside but was lit "from within" and from it they lit the numerous lights and candles of the great temple (*Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, chapter 24.4).[747]

And here is one detail, but very characteristic and illuminating: According to the most ancient Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople from the ninth–tenth century, which is contained in the codices of *Patmos 266* and *T. Staurou 40* (see also in the *Codex Paris 1587* from the twelfth century), "The light of Christ . . ." was said not between the two readings, but after the end of the second one: "And at the end of the two readings the deacon takes the candlestick and enters saying, 'The light of Christ illumines all.' And immediately the deacon says 'Wisdom' and the presbyter, 'Peace be to all' and the chanter begins 'Let my prayer be set forth.'"[748] This was the original place of, "The light of Christ . . . ." From this witness, it is concluded:

> 1) That "The light of Christ . . ." did not have any relationship to the readings, but to "Let my prayer be set forth." Its

747. *Itinerarium Egeriae* 24.4 in *Égérie, Journal de Voyage*, ed. and trans. Pierre Maraval, SC 296 (Paris: Cerf, 1982), 238. This fourth century writing is a travelogue of a woman's pilgrimage to Palestine, Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Asia Minor. The writing is divided into two parts: a diary of the pilgrimage and a description of services in Jerusalem. Phountoulēs's attribution and titling of this work (Ὁδοιπορικὸν τῆς Αἰθερίας, *Peregrinatio* of Aetheria) reflect the scholarly discussion at the time of his writing. Current scholarship predominantly attributes authorship to a writer known as Egeria and titles the work *Itinerarium Egeriae*. Speculation regarding the author's homeland includes Aquitaine, Gallia Narbonensis, southern Gaul, and Galicia. Aside from recently discovered fragments, the work is contained in one surviving eleventh century manuscript, the *Codex Aretinus 405*. This discussion is based on Anne McGowan and Paul F. Bradshaw, trans., *The Pilgrimage of Egeria, A New Translation of the Itinerarium Egeriae with Introduction and Commentary* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press Academic, 2018) and George E. Gingras, trans., *Egeria: Diary of a Pilgrimage*, Ancient Christian Writers, no. 38 (New York: Newman Press, 1970). Additional information may be found in John Wilkinson, trans., *Egeria's Travels*, 3rd ed. (Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1999) and Victor Parra-Guinaldo, "Itinerarium Egeriae: A Retrospective Look and Preliminary Study of a New Approach to the Issue of Authorship-provenance," *Linguistics and Literature Studies* 7 (2019): 13–21.

748. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 1:246–247.

transfer between the readings took place later, obviously in order that time be given for the lighting of the lights of the temple, so that during "Let my prayer be set forth . . ." the temple is illuminated. From "Let my prayer be set forth . . .," the Liturgy of the Presanctified is indeed differentiated from the usual Vespers of Lent;

2) It is explained why "The light of Christ . . ." is not said when a Presanctified does not take place during a Vespers of Lent, even if two readings similar to those of the Presanctified are read during them;

3) It is explained why it was not formerly said during the Presanctifieds of Wednesday and Friday of Cheesefare and during Great Friday, during which "Let my prayer be set forth" was also not said;

4) The liturgically strange position of "The light of Christ . . .," where it is said nowadays between the prokeimenon of the second reading and its title is explained. When the transfer took place, the readings had been formed along with their prokeimena and the choice of a place for "The light of Christ . . ." presented difficulties; and

5) It is explained why later the deacon, or the priest blessed, not only with the candle, but also with the censer, since while holding both of them they directly did the censing immediately during the chanting of "Let my prayer be set forth . . . ."

With the passage of time, this point of the Liturgy of the Presanctified, as with many other elements of our worship, "grew old." It lost its real purpose and remained a "mysterious" form. A peculiar blessing, which is accompanied by a liturgical phrase, whose meaning was sought outside of its historical origin and its original and precise liturgical purpose.

231

A letter.

A retired hierarch of the Ecumenical Patriarchate did us the honor of sending a letter in which, apart from other things, he also notes certain recommendations that relate to the correction of several irregularities that take place in the Divine Liturgy. We published below the relevant section of his letter and thank him that he desired to contribute to the work of this column and to make us sharers of his rich experience and elderly wisdom. At the end, he will allow us to also make some notes on what he wrote.

" . . .Why is the Typikon of the Great Church violated by some priests, which was created for the removal of disorder in the Divine Liturgy, and indeed:

a) When one priest serves, he stands and chants "O come, let us worship . . ."[749] in the small entrance (even indeed when he is completely tone deaf or also has a bad voice), while this is proper when two priests and a hierarch serve. The priest just says, "Wisdom, arise,"[750] immediately enters the bēma solemnly while chanting nothing.

b) In the great entrance, some priests stand and, after saying "May the Lord our God remember you in his kingdom . . .,"[751] they read names and the worst ill-sounding, as we heard, among others, "and the servant of God, Amersouda"![752] At hearing this, the congregation began to laugh and to whisper many things. The priest shall go directly into the holy bēma. All the names that must be commemorated

749. "Δεῦτε προσκυνήσωμεν . . ."

750. "Σοφία, ὀρθοί."

751. "Πάντων ἡμῶν μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ . . ."

752. The female name, Ἀμερσούδα, is not a baptismal name, but a colloquial nickname. The name is also mentioned in the title of a crude folk song from Mytilene, "'Η θεία μου ἡ Ἀμερσούδα . . ." (My Aunt Amersouda . . .) which was popularly sung by Sophia Vembo (Σοφία Βέμπο) (1910–1978), who was most active during the Second World War and honored for her patriotism. The bishop may be suggesting that the laughter of the congregation was caused by the fact that this was not only a nickname but one that had been defamed by a crude folk song. It should be noted that Mytilene fell under the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Phountoulēs was born on the island of Lesbos.

are proper to the hierarch alone.

c) In Matins and in the dismissal, some priests commemorate names of saints not contained in the Leitourgikon, quite pointlessly.

All these and similar things are taking place with brazenness, and weary the congregation.

First of all, they must learn to recite clearly and melodiously. Do you not see how the announcers on radio and television recite and sing marvelously and with ease? They certainly practice beforehand. How then do we want to attract Christians to the Church? To do what? To hear whom? Also, the movements of many of our priests are uncoordinated.

Another squall recently erupted in the church: while the chanters chant the Cherubic hymn and the people are following the Cherubic hymn's melody with fear and trembling, our priests themselves also blare out the same with a loud voice in a way that one raises the question, "Do we find ourselves in bedlam?"[753]

In addition, the priests must not chant "with the nose,"[754] a thing very repulsive for today's generation.

Certainly, it requires effort and interest in order for these things to be accomplished."

1. According to the *Diataxis* of Philotheos, which has been incorporated into our liturgical books, as well as according to the standard rubrics of the oldest manuscripts, "O come, let us worship . . ." was chanted by the choir.[755] After "Wisdom, arise," the priest and deacon entered the bēma without chanting anything. This applies even nowadays according to the rubrics of our Hieratika. In later manuscripts, dating from the sixteenth century onward, there is testimony that the eisodikon was chanted by the celebrants. This is indeed one of the many influences from hierarchical practice that affects the Liturgy of priests, chiefly through concelebrations and the

753. The term used, "χάβραν," translated here as "bedlam," can also mean, "synagogue."

754. In other words, in a nasal manner.

755. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 6–7.

practice of archimandrites, namely, of abbots, who, as is well known, also possess other hierarchical privileges in their monasteries. Some of these influences have been gradually and officially established in our modern liturgical practice. There exists no doubt that the imitation of hierarchical practices takes place, at least most times, from a good intention, with a view toward contributing greater splendor to divine worship. However, I think, it is unnecessary for it to be noted that the priestly Liturgy has in itself both splendor and simplicity, of which the hierarchical Liturgy would also be envious. Therefore, not only for reasons of observing the Typikon, but also for more substantial reasons, our priests must avoid the imitations that present them in the eyes of the congregation (many times unjustly) as attempting to appropriate things that do not belong to them, namely, "they play bishop."[756]

2. The commemoration of names during the great entrance is not encountered in the manuscript tradition, nor even in the hierarchical Liturgy and appears that it was introduced into our liturgical practice during the end of the eighteenth century. The succinct, "May the Lord God remember all of you . . .,"[757] was previously said, one or even more times. "May the Lord God remember your archpriesthood . . ."[758] was introduced first, as it seems, into the hierarchical Liturgy, and as an answer of the courtesy, "May the Lord God remember your priesthood . . ."[759] and "May the Lord God remember your sacred diaconate . . .,"[760] which was said by the hierarch, and which afterward was expanded and also included a commemoration of the living and the dead also by name. In any case, up until the fourteenth century, according to the *Diataxis of the Liturgy of the Patriarch that is done in the Great Church* (*Codex Hag. Saba 362/607*), the hierarch went to meet the holy gifts, and placed them on the holy table without making the commemoration customary nowadays. In the introduction of this commemoration, perhaps the ten-

756. "κάμνουν τὸν δεσπότην".
757. "Πάντων ὑμῶν μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεός . . ."
758. "Τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης σου μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεός . . ."
759. "Τῆς ἱερωσύνης σου μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεός . . ."
760. "Τῆς ἱεροδιακονίας σου μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεός . . ."

dency contributed for the ektenēs to be omitted, where there existed a special petition for the living and those who had "fallen asleep," and where according to the traditional taxis the names were inserted. The commemoration during the great entrance has many disadvantages: the prolonging of the entrance, the grammatical and syntactical mistakes that we frequently hear, the danger of people-pleasing, the narrowing of the offering especially of Sundays and feasts to only certain persons, and so forth. The succinct and most ancient, "May the Lord God remember all of you . . .," is sufficient. The rest is superfluous. The names of the faithful are commemorated, apart from the ektenēs, both during the prothesis and during the diptychs of the Divine Liturgy.

3. We have written on other occasions as well that the form of the present dismissal is later. The Liturgy originally concluded with "Let us go forth in peace."[761] Afterward, the prayer behind the ambōn was added as a dismissal prayer of blessing. The present dismissal, "May Christ our true God . . .,"[762] had a most simple form when it was introduced into our services. It is encountered in later manuscripts with different variations. The Theotokos, the cross, and the apostles alone are generally commemorated. By name only, the saint whose name the Divine Liturgy bears: Basileios the Great or the sacred Chrysostomos, and, in the Presanctified, Grēgorios the Dialogist or the patriarch Germanos. In some, the archangels and the saint of the day are added. Under these forms, it is encountered in later manuscripts. Its development is recent, not older than the eighteenth century. It appears that the martyrs, the Blessed and God-bearing Fathers, the ancestors of God, and the saint of the temple were the first to be added. Afterwards obviously from the influence of "Save, O God, your people . . ."[763] of Matins, of the entreaties of the Litē, and perhaps also of the commemorations of the proskomidē, it took its well-known dimensions. Thus, saints were added, for whom the people had special reverence, and other local saints, to the point that sometimes the dismissal ends up becoming an endless glossary of

761. "Ἐν εἰρήνῃ προέλθωμεν . . ."
762. "Χριστὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . ."
763. "Σῶσον ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαόν σου . . ."

names. The correct liturgical tradition of our Church offers us also in the present case the golden measure of simplicity and solemn sobriety.

Concerning the remaining observations of His Eminence, notes are not required. It is unacceptable for the "works of the Lord" to be performed "carelessly."[764]

232

Is it necessary for the priest to commune thrice from the holy chalice or once?

In a previous answer (questions 106 and 107), we dealt extensively with the subject of triple communion from the holy chalice and the phrases that accompany it. There, we gathered together both the old and more recent witnesses relevant to this issue. Unfortunately, it is one of those issues to which no one can answer with a direct evangelical "yes" or "no."[765] And this is because there exists a divergence between the ancient practice, which is the one both theoretically and logically most correct, namely, of communion only one time from the Precious Blood, on the one hand, and the relatively later one, but which has become completely and generally prevalent.

The triple communion is attested as a commonly applied practice by the standard rubrics of the liturgical manuscripts from at least the thirteenth century. But note that the oldest manuscripts do not have clear rubrics for us to be able, based on them, to assert that up until then the old manner of communion was applied. Indeed, on the contrary, the unanimity of the manuscripts from the thirteenth century and the Diataxeis of the Divine Liturgy, which appear since then, are indicative that most probably before the thirteenth century communion from the chalice was done three times.

The boundaries of the competency of the writer are exhausted at this point.

764. "ἐπικατάρατος ὁ ποιῶν τὰ ἔργα Κυρίου ἀμελῶς," Jer 31:10.
765. Matthew 5:37.

233

During the elevation, is the holy chalice also elevated together with the Holy Bread?

Question 181 addressed the topic of the elevation of the Holy Bread. There, we saw that the lamb alone is elevated and not the entire paten. The witnesses in question of the liturgical tradition are so clear and the theological meaning of this practice so clearly formulated by the Fathers who comment on the Divine Liturgy that there cannot exist a margin of doubt or an objection over this. Moreover, as was proven in the answer to question 180, the particles are not consecrated and are not changed into the Body of Christ. Therefore, those priests who elevate the entire paten, lamb and particles together during the elevation, do so wrongly.

The question above is related, but also somewhat different. However, it presupposes what we wrote in the answers above, where the patristic testimonies and the related standard rubrics of the liturgical manuscripts have been assembled, matters which we will not repeat. The difference from the previous question consists in the fact that the content of the holy chalice, in contrast with the particles, is consecrated and changed into the Blood of Christ. In addition, the priest and the faithful will not commune only from the Precious Body, but also from the Precious Blood; consequently, the "Holy Things" mean both eucharistic species at the same time. This precisely appears to have called for the co-elevation of the lamb and chalice, concerning which the questioner speaks. This certainly is also the "theological" reason, which the introducers of this practice are invoking in order to justify it.

However, this innovation is not justified. The chalice was never elevated at the time of the elevation but the Precious Body alone. Moreover, the elevation is the first action of the fraction of the Bread[766] and its initial origin must certainly be sought in it. In order for us to break something, it is necessary first for us to hold it in our hands, for us to raise it. The liturgical and symbolic embellishment

766. Phountoulēs here means the consecrated Holy Bread, namely, the Body of Christ.

of this originally most simple movement led to the evolution of the practice of the elevation of the Holy Bread, as it was handed down and as it is even performed up until nowadays. For the holy chalice, there does not exist an analogous practical reason that called for its elevation.

No matter what the practical-historical starting point of the elevation might be, it was limited only to the elevation of the Holy Bread. This is absolutely clear and verified. An elevation also of the chalice never took place.

However, what about the "theological" reasons that we referred to above and appear to be an argument in favor of the elevation also of the Holy Blood? We also wrote on another occasion that we are interpreters of the liturgical tradition of the Church. The correctness of our interpretation is always judged by its conformity with the correct liturgical practice. Otherwise, it leads to abuses, to a form of liturgical Protestantism, foreign to the spirit of Orthodox worship. Much more when, in the name of "theology" of this type, the liturgical tradition is polluted, as if the Church was found in error up until nowadays, and as if its Fathers and its celebrants did not think or act correctly, who, when basing themselves upon the tradition from the foundation of the Church, elevated the Holy Bread in question alone.

234

In the absence of a deacon, when are the prayers of the antiphons said?

235

In the absence of a deacon, is "Let us love one another . . ."[767] said by the priest facing the people?

The Divine Liturgy, but in part also other services of our Church, have been composed in such a manner that the participation of the deacon in them constitutes an indispensable element for their har-

767. "Ἀγαπήσωμεν ἀλλήλους . . ."

monious celebration. The deacon is, as it were, the master of ceremonies and the intermediary between priest and people. He reminds the priest of the readings and actions ("Bless . . . ,"[768] "Command . . . ,"[769] "Break . . . ,"[770] and so forth), puts into the mouths of the people the subjects of prayer ("Let us pray to the Lord,"[771] "For . . . ,"[772] and so forth), regulates the posture ("Let us bow . . . ,"[773] "Arise,"[774] and so forth), and draws their attention at the key points of the Divine Liturgy ("Let us attend,"[775] "Wisdom,"[776] and so forth). In the ancient church, special books existed for the deacons, the "Diakonika," just as the "Hieratika" existed for the priests and the "Archieratika" for the hierarchs. When over time the deacons began to become scarce, the priests also shouldered the role of the deacon, and the Diakonika were merged into the Hieratika. The priest simultaneously became the deacon as well. This brought difficulties into normal celebration and resulted in quite a few distortions in our liturgical books and in liturgical practice in general. These points are necessary for us to come to the answer to the two questions above.

The format that the individual elements of our services follow is the following: The deacon introduces the supplication while encouraging the community to prayer and putting into the mouth of the people the entreaties of the prayer. Afterwards, the priest comes to summarize the entreaties, while offering to God a related prayer that he concludes with an exclamation, namely, with a doxological conclusion that, in contrast to the prayer, is said in a melodious way. Finally, the people participate in the entreaties of the prayer with the "Amen" and chant a suitable hymn. Early, it became prevalent for the prayers of the Divine Liturgy to be said "inaudibly" (μυστικῶς). Customarily, the priest said them during the time when the deacon

768. "Εὐλόγησον . . ."
769. "Κέλευσον . . ."
770. "Μέλισον . . ."
771. "Τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."
772. "Ὑπέρ . . ."
773. "Κλίνωμεν . . ."
774. "Ὀρθοί . . ."
775. "Πρόσχωμεν."
776. "Σοφία."

said the synaptē, in any case before the exclamation. When a deacon was not present, the problem was acute. The priest was not able to say the diaconal petitions and a prayer at the same time. New places were then sought for the prayers at a vacant time for the priest. The exclamations, as a liturgically more vital element, remained in their original places, but the prayers suffered so many moves and transfers that oftentimes they lost every contact with their original place and their ending, namely, the exclamation. They were oftentimes said in reverse order, namely, after the exclamation, just as the prayer of the trisagion, in part also of the antiphons. Formerly, they were said well before the exclamation, as happened with the prayers of Vespers and of Matins, even with the first prayer of the antiphons for the Presanctified, which was said, according to some manuscripts, before the enarxis of the service. The fact that this is an example of the decline of our services is scarcely even necessary for us to note. In some cases, the problems that have been created are so complex that the recognition of the original course of the service and the detection of the prayers that belong to each group is oftentimes almost impossible, and their restoration to their original place hard to achieve.

Specifically, the prayers of the antiphons of the Liturgy must be said after the "To you, O Lord"[777] of the people and before their exclamation. It is possible for this to be done whether a deacon is present or not, if the prayers are said "within earshot"[778] of the people according to the modern tendency, where the most ancient custom in question tends to be restored. But if otherwise, it would remain—despite the prayers being said during the chanting of the antiphon after the exclamation—in reverse, just as the prayer of the trisagion hymn is also said. This is certainly not ideal, but the only possible solution under the prevailing conditions. Personally, the writer would not approve of this solution. He would prefer, even if the prayers are said inaudibly (μυστικῶς) and a deacon does not concelebrate, for them to be said in their historically and logically correct original place, namely, before the exclamation. The prayers

777. "Σοί, Κύριε."

778. "εἰς ἐπήκοον." In other words, the prayers are said out loud, "in the hearing," of the people.

of the antiphons are quite brief and could, at least in part, be covered by a little protraction of "To you, O Lord" of the choir or even by a few seconds of silence, just as precisely takes place in the prayers of inclination.

As regards to the "Let us love one another . . .,"[779] or the parallel, "Let us bow our head to the Lord,"[780] given that this belongs to the diaconal commands to the people, it would be in vain for us to search in the tradition in which place the priest said this, since the tradition always presupposes, as we saw, the presence of the deacon. However, it is very natural and logically more correct and proper after the blessing for the priest not to turn his back to the people, but, given that he is facing them, for him to speak to them and give the liturgical command while gazing at them. Let us not forget that even the deacons were formerly turned toward the people, or at least, in a later period, looked to the east, as nowadays, but were elevated on the ambōn, which was found in the middle of the temple and of the people, a place which ensured supervision over the people and did not isolate the deacons from them, as nowadays, when the deacons stand before the beautiful gate with their backs to the congregation.

236

Is "O Heavenly King . . ."[781] said before the exclamation, "Blessed is the kingdom"[782]?

According to the prevailing taxis nowadays, "O Heavenly King . . ." is recited by the priest before the exclamation of the enarxis of the Divine Liturgy, namely, "Blessed is the kingdom . . .." As far as I know, the first witness to this is in the *Codex Patmos 719* from the thirteenth century and in the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of the patriarch of Constantinople, Philotheos (fourteenth century). In the latter, this practice is not yet presented completely solidified, since the priest had the possibility of selecting between "O Heav-

779. "Ἀγαπήσωμεν ἀλλήλους . . ."
780. "Τὰς κεφαλὰς ἡμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ κλίνωμεν."
781. "Βασιλεῦ οὐράνιε . . ."
782. "Εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία . . ."

enly King" and "Glory to God in the highest"[783] ("standing together before the holy table [the priest and deacon] make three prostrations while they pray to themselves and say, 'O Heavenly King' or 'Glory to God in the highest' twice, and 'O Lord, open my lips,"[784] *Panteleēmonos 6277-770*).[785] We have no relevant witnesses from older codices. Indeed, a more succinct *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy*, which is found in the *Codex National Library of Athens 662* (twelfth–thirteenth century), while it describes in detail the preparatory practices of the priest, makes no mention at all of "O Heavenly King."[786] Therefore, consistent with these facts, "O Heavenly King" must be introduced at this place of the Divine Liturgy around the twelfth century and certainly not in general. Its introduction was due to the tendency that presents itself during this period, more or less, of the addition to the Divine Liturgy of various supplementary elements, such as psalmic verses, dialogues between priest and deacon, and troparia that chiefly have a preparatory character for the celebrating priest. Such elements existed from the beginning and exist even nowadays in the original text of the Divine Liturgy, such as for example, the prayer, "No one is worthy . . ."[787] before the mystical part of the Divine Liturgy, the prayer before the "Our Father," the Lord's prayer, the prayer of inclination, the "Hearken, O Lord . . ."[788] before Holy Communion, and so forth.[789] But when, from continuous use, these elements lost their original gravity, other ways of preparation were sought, newer and thus more impressive. This tendency reached a period of great intensity, so much so that in many later manuscripts the original text of the Divine Liturgy was smothered by the recitation of troparia, prayers, verses, and other elements, whose insertion sometimes also took place inopportunely, such as for example, "O Lord, who did send down at the third hour

783. "Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις . . ."
784. "Κύριε, τὰ χείλη μου ἀνοίξεις . . ."
785. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 5.
786. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 1–5.
787. "Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος . . ."
788. "Πρόσχες Κύριε . . ."
789. Phountoulēs considers all these elements as preparatory.

your All-holy Spirit . . ."[790] before the invocation (ἐπίκλησις). Fortunately, not everything was preserved in the printed texts.

"O Heavenly King . . ." was specifically introduced as an invocation to the Holy Spirit in order that the priest be deemed worthy through His grace to celebrate the mystery. Consequently, it was placed before the blessing that would mark the beginning of its celebration. For the same theological reasons, "O Heavenly King" was added, perhaps in the same period, also at the beginning of the first service of each group of services of the daily cycle, when the reason fell into use or was forgotten for which the Fiftieth Psalm was originally set at the start of the services, or when from later additions this psalm was no longer at the beginning of the services. Thus, the services of the Midnight Office, Matins, and Compline began with the Fiftieth Psalm, which had a preparatory character for the intense feeling of repentance that prevails in it and for the invocations before the Holy Spirit that are contained in it ("and renew a right spirit within me . . . and take not your Holy Spirit from me . . . and with your governing Spirit establish me . . . O Lord, you shall open my lips . . . ," verses 12, 13, 14, 17). "O Heavenly King" later entered the beginning of the Midnight Office, Matins (when it was not attached to the Midnight Office), Third Hour, and Ninth Hour. With the difference that there, "O Heavenly King" in the Hours found a place after the blessing of the enarxis, while in the Divine Liturgy before it, since obviously this element of the Divine Liturgy was already completely formed and, in contrast to the other services that we mentioned, it was not easy for it to undergo new modifications.

In any case, let it be noted that inasmuch as "O Heavenly King . . ." is said during the short service of the "kairos" which was fashioned in later times specifically for the preparation of the priest for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, its repetition also again before "Blessed is the kingdom . . ." would be logically unjustifiable, but in addition, could be characterized as a type of liturgical anachronism. Namely, while we adopted the later service of the "kairos," in which all of the preparatory elements were assembled, conse-

790. "Κύριε ὁ τὸ πανάγιόν σου Πνεύμα . . ."

quently also "O Heavenly King," we hold on to the repetition of the latter in that same place where it existed before either the service of the "kairos" was introduced or, at the least, before also "O Heavenly King . . ." was included there.

237

Is the prayer of the small entrance, "O Master, Lord our God, who established the orders and hosts of angels and archangels in the heavens . . .,"[791] as well as that of the great entrance, "May the Lord God remember all of us in his kingdom . . .,"[792] said while walking?

According to present-day practice, both the prayer of the small entrance and "May the Lord God remember all of you in his kingdom . . ."[793] are said while walking. To the question whether this is done rightly on the basis of the elements of our liturgical tradition, the answer for the first must be negative, but for the second, affirmative. And let us see how things are.

1) According to all the manuscripts and even the printed Euchologia and Hieratika, the Diataxeis of the Divine Liturgy, and the Fathers who are commentators of the Divine Liturgy, the prayer of the entrance was said in the middle of the temple, "in the center of the temple"[794] or "in the usual place"[795] (where it is determined that it was "the middle of the temple"[796]). There the priest and deacon stood, "both bowing their heads." The deacon delivered the exhortation, "Let us pray to the Lord"[797] or "In peace let us pray to the Lord."[798] The priest said the prayer of the entrance and "raising himself"[799]

791. "Δέσποτα Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ καταστήσας ἐν οὐρανοῖς τάγματα καὶ στρατιὰς ἀγγέλων καὶ ἀρχαγγέλων . . ."
792. "Πάντων ἡμῶν μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ . . ."
793. "Πάντων ὑμῶν μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ . . ."
794. "ἐν τῷ μεσονάῳ."
795. "ἐν τῷ συνήθει τόπῳ."
796. "μέσον τοῦ ναοῦ."
797. "Τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."
798. "Ἐν εἰρήνῃ τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."
799. "ἐγειρόμενος." This refers to the priest raising his head from an inclined position.

blesses the entrance as usual. This deep inclination and raising of the head symbolically signified "that the Lord descended to us, died, was buried, and descended into Hades" and rose (Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Dialogue*, chapter 98; *Explanation*, 54).[800] The prayer of the entrance and the blessing were said up until the twelfth century after the end of the chanting of the third antiphon within earshot of the people. From this period, the recitation "softly"[801] or "inaudibly"[802] of the prayer, and of all the other liturgical phrases that surround it, was introduced and became prevalent also at this place.

The recitation of the prayer in the middle of the temple was preserved for us only during the hierarchical Liturgy. During ordinary Liturgies, the priest whispers to himself the prayer while walking and leaves only the blessing of the entrance for "the usual place." This is obviously due to the tendency that has become widespread of limiting the third antiphon to only one troparion for reasons of brevity. The priest no longer had the time to recite the prayer in the middle of the temple, where it had previously become prevalent for it to be said inaudibly, and, since its frequent repetition aided him in knowing it by heart, he said it during the procession in order to save time. However, formerly, when the apolytikion was chanted with the verses of the antiphon at least three times or, according to monastic custom, the Beatitudes were chanted with their troparia or with the third and sixth odes of the canon of the saint being celebrated, he certainly had all the time needed to proceed comfortably to the middle of the temple and to recite the prayer there. The fact that this is not only historically more correct but also more proper, is not necessary even to discuss. The limitation of the length of the sacred services is certainly a need that is imposed by the demands of our times, but it is also simultaneously an ailment, which tends to seriously harm our worship, if it is not approached and remedied correctly. However, the next question will give us the opportunity to speak in more detail regarding this topic.

800. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 242–243, 114–115.
801. "ἠρέμα."
802. "μυστικῶς."

2) The entrance of the precious gifts was originally done without special pomp, certainly with the participation of the deacons alone, without either them saying something or anything being chanted at this time This original practice was precisely preserved in the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions* (book 8). When the preparation of the precious gifts developed and their transfer to the altar began to assume a festive and solemn character, it was considered appropriate for the dead time to be covered with the chanting of some antiphon and it is very possible that the Twenty-Third Psalm was selected as such. A little later, the psalm was replaced by a hymn inspired by the same psalm, which is the present-day Cherubic hymn or the other corresponding hymns, "Let all mortal flesh keep silent . . .,"[803] "Now the powers of heavens . . .,"[804] and specifically for Great Thursday, its apolytikion, "Of your mystical supper . . .."[805] However, the transfer of the precious gifts took place while the antiphon or troparion was chanted, without the deacons saying anything, or the priests, when also they now took part in the procession. This practice was preserved in the ancient Liturgies of the evangelist Markos and of Iakōvos the Brother of God, but also partly in the Liturgy of the Presanctified.

During the third phase of the development of the great entrance, the deacon and the priest did not pass through the temple in silence, but said inaudibly or "chanted to themselves" psalms known by memory or hymns, such as the trisagion (there even exists an allusion regarding this also in the Cherubic hymn, "who sing the thrice-holy hymn"[806]), Psalm 50 or Psalm 23, and on Sunday, "Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . .."[807] In any case, from the twelfth century, at the latest, the phrase, "May the Lord God remember all of us (ἡμῶν) in his kingdom . . .,"[808] is encountered in manuscripts, which was said "in a loud voice."[809] There also exists in the manuscripts the reading, "of you" (ὑμῶν), which appears more correct

803. "Σιγησάτω πᾶσα σὰρξ βροτεία . . ."
804. "Νῦν αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν . . ."
805. "Τοῦ δείπνου σου τοῦ μυστικοῦ . . ."
806. "τὸν τρισάγιον ὕμνον προσᾴδοντες."
807. "Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι . . ."
808. "Πάντων ἡμῶν μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ . . ."
809. "μεγαλοφώνως."

because it is explained by the standard rubrics that this prayer was said "on behalf of all" (ὑπὲρ πάντων) or "toward the people" (πρὸς τὸν λαόν). According to some manuscripts, they said it "when they arrive in the middle of the temple," according to others even when they came out of the bēma. However, according to most manuscripts and according to the *Diataxis* of Philotheos, they prayed, "May the Lord God remember all of you (ὑμῶν) in his kingdom . . .,"[810] "toward the people"; and both of them[811] in succession and repeatedly with small variations each time, "when entering" or "passing through the temple":[812]

Πάντων ὑμῶν μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεός . . .	May the Lord God remember all of you . . .
Μνησθείη ὑμῶν Κύριος ὁ Θεός . . .	May the Lord God remember you . . .
Μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς πάντων ὑμῶν . . .	May the Lord God remember all of you . . .
Μνησθείη πάντων ὑμῶν Κύριος . . .	May the Lord God remember all of you . . .
Μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τῆς ἱερωσύνης [ἢ τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης σου] . . .	May the Lord God remember your priesthood [or your archpriesthood] . . .

This becomes generally prevalent also nowadays. The fact that the phrase, "May the Lord God remember all of you in his kingdom . . .," was introduced to be said during the course of the procession, is apparent in contrast to the prayer of the entrance from its brevity and because it is easy to memorize.

If this place of the Divine Liturgy would require some improvement, this could be done on the basis of the most ancient practice that is observed on the Holy Mountain, but in part also locally and in parishes. Namely, instead of the deacon or the priest saying "May the Lord God remember all of you . . ." only one time in the

810. "Πάντων ὑμῶν μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ . . ."

811. The words, "both of them," refers to the priest and deacon.

812. Although the word order can be changed in Greek for "Πάντων ὑμῶν μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ βασιλειᾳ αὐτοῦ . . .," which is reproduced in the table below, these phrases are translated almost identically.

well-known slow manner, especially while traversing large temples, it could be repeated in different variants successively. I think that this manner of reciting the prayer has in its favor not only the most ancient tradition and practice of the Holy Mountain, but it would also be aesthetically more beautiful and sacredly befitting. It would not be difficult to be attempted.

238

Is it possible for "Holy God . . ." to be said only three times, without "Glory . . . both now . . ." and "Dynamis"[813]?

The chanting of the trisagion hymn during the Divine Liturgy, as well as everything that accompanies it, presents complex historical problems. Their development is lengthy and does not directly interest us here for the elucidation of the above question, the answer to which is not related only with historical development, but also with as many various facets that are directly connected with it. It would be only useful to note that the trisagion was introduced into the Liturgy as an entrance hymn chanted by the chanters, the clergy, and the people, not only three times, but at the least ten times as a stichēron likely of Psalm 79, just as "Christ is risen . . ."[814] in the services of Pascha. From the psalm, the key verse was preserved during the hierarchical Liturgy, which was originally said by the deacon at the time of the entrance before "Glory to the Father . . .," "[Lord, O Lord] look down from heaven and behold . . ."[815] (verses 15–16). Later, with the successive addition of other eisodika and particularly of antiphons, while the trisagion was preserved, its chanting was reduced to the minimum possible, namely, its triple repetition, the "Glory . . . both now . . ." with its ending,[816] and its final more intense and melodic repetition, namely, the "Dynamis" or "perissē,"

---

813. The word, "δύναμις," is variously translated in English language versions of the Divine Liturgy. However, it is often left in Greek, even in completely translated services. One translation is, "with strength."

814. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη . . ."

815. "[Κύριε, Κύριε], ἐπίβλεψον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἴδε . . ."

816. "Ἅγιος ἀθάνατος ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς" (Holy immortal have mercy on us).

as it was referred to in the ancient parish service.[817] In the hierarchical Liturgy and in concelebrations, a small step backwards takes place that returns us to the relatively older practice, to the antiphonal chanting between chanters and clergy and to the verse/remnant of its ancient stichologia. The fact that the priests also took part in the chanting of the trisagion is also shown by the preservation of its recitation also by them privately, whether it is a concelebration or not. A new reduction in the number of trisagia or mutilation of their conclusion is not liturgically possible. The present most simple form is the only acceptable abridgment, consistent with the presuppositions of the Byzantine liturgical tradition and chant.

The second reason that does not permit the abridgment of the chanting of the trisagion is a practical one. According to the modern taxis, after the exclamation, "For you, our God, are holy . . .,"[818] during the chanting of the trisagion, the priest ought to read the relatively lengthy prayer of the trisagion hymn, "O Holy God, who is resting among the holy ones...,"[819] to recite the trisagion, as usual, and to move to the throne (or to the prothesis, as happens among us nowadays) while saying, "Blessed is he who comes . . .,"[820] and so forth. All these things require a certain amount of time, and this must be covered by the chanting of the trisagion. Regarding the place of the prayer, we have a related question, and we will return to it. In any event, what prevails nowadays among us is for this prayer to be read after its exclamation and while the trisagion is chanted outside.

A third reason equally serious is the following: Recently, much discussion is taking place regarding the participation of the people in divine worship. One way of participating is also chanting together,

817. The "περισσή" (perissē) is the double final repetition of the entire troparion. The term sometimes refers to a second refrain substituted at the end of the antiphon for the final repetition of the troparion, see Robert F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Vol. II, The Great Entrance: A History of the Transfer of Gifts and Other Preanaphoral Rites*, OCA 200, 4th ed. (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 2004), 88. In the trisagion of the Divine Liturgy, the "Dynamis" is nothing other than the ancient "perissē."

818. "Ὅτι ἅγιος εἶ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . ."

819. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἅγιος, ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπαυόμενος . . ."

820. "Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος . . ."

in which many hopes rest concerning the renewal of our worship. However, while in theory we support these things, in practice we do not give the people the possibility of participation. The people can only chant hymns brief and easy in melody. Lengthy and rarely heard troparia, or hymns whose chanting requires musical knowledge, were always chanted by the chanters, because it was by nature impossible for the congregation to learn them by heart and to be in symphony during their chanting. "Holy God . . .," "Through the intercessions of the Theotokos . . .,"[821] "Save us, O Son of God . . .,"[822] and a few easy antiphons are the only elements that the people can chant together. However, if these are truncated and reduced, as a tendency exists, to "Through the intercessions . . ." two times, "Holy God . . ." three times, and so forth, in the end, against our opposite desires, we will completely isolate the people from what is chanted. During the former age when the people chanted together, the possibility of participation in divine worship was given to them. For this reason, the ephymnia were also said many times. The repetition does not tire when all participate in the chanting; on the contrary, it facilitates chanting together and emphasizes the collectiveness of divine worship. These short hymns cannot be considered as an ordinary prayer, and we cannot easily impute the accusation of "foolish babbling"[823] to their repetition. Their repetition was not due to caprice or to a love for some lengthy and endless services, which prevailed in the ancient period, but was based on strong liturgical and psychological foundations.

But the objection will be flimsy, namely, the length of the service that must be reduced when heeding the commands of our impatient age. Without anyone denying the seriousness of this situation that compelled the Church during the course of the centuries to make a plethora of abridgments to its services, even in the legitimacy of such an action, we must put the matter in its correct context. In the first place, our Liturgy is not as long as we normally think. Any excess of reasonable time limits within which it moves is chiefly due

821. "Ταῖς πρεσβεῖαις τῆς Θεοτόκου . . ."
822. "Σῶσον ἡμᾶς, Υἱὲ Θεοῦ . . ."
823. "βαττολογία" (Lampe, s.v. "βαττολογία, ἡ").

to the slow manner of chanting, not only of the hymns of the choir, but also of the priestly and diaconal elements. This languid manner of chanting, which was sometimes considered festive, nowadays exhausts the faithful and unjustifiably tires them. We can best gain time when chanting the hymns in a simpler and more sacredly befitting manner and reciting what belongs to the deacon and priest in an easily understood, clear, and concise manner, without vocal displays and orientalisms.[824] Thus, we would leave a possibility of participation in the chanting to the people, since there would not exist a need for us to reduce the repetition of simple hymns/ephymnia that belong to them. A simple and rhythmic trisagion, even if it is chanted many times, cannot last as long as a slow "Dynamis."

239

Is the prayer of the prothesis, "O God, our God . . .,"[825] read where it is nowadays in the liturgical books, or at the time of the Cherubic hymn?

The prothesis of the precious gifts that is sealed with the "prayer of the prothesis" was originally done at the time when the gifts were about to be transferred to the altar, where, as we saw in previous answers, it was later adorned with the chanting of the Cherubic hymn. We find it in this place in the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, in the Jerusalemite Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, and in the Alexandrian Liturgy of Markos the Evangelist. In the two latter ones, the prayer of the prothesis still exists at this point.

When the preparation of the gifts began to develop into a semi-independent rite, obviously to save time the prothesis was transferred before the enarxis of the Liturgy in order that necessary

824. The word, "ἀνατολισμούς," translated here as "orientalisms," refers to the distortion of chanting, colloquially known as "ἀμανέδες," which takes its name from the musical repetition and elongation of the word, "ἀμάν" in rembetika and other secular music of Asia Minor. In general, modern schools of Byzantine chant consider them inappropriate. The "ἀνατολισμοί" (orientalisms) may be a historical result of the role untrained singers often took in performing both secular and ecclesiastical music and not discerning between their distinct forms.

825. "Ὁ Θεός, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . ."

time during the Cherubic hymn is left particularly for the performance of the entrance of the gifts, which had also itself begun to develop more festively and splendidly. The Liturgy began at that time with the eisodikon—namely, nowadays, the third antiphon—and the prothesis took place before it. However, in order that it not take place in silence, the chanting of the two antiphons was introduced shortly after and thus, together with the pre-existing antiphon/eisodikon, the sacred liturgical number, three, was constituted. During the antiphons, the proskomidē could comfortably be done, which had not yet assumed its present lengthy form. The three antiphons were complete psalms and were chanted antiphonally by verse with the known emphymnia. However, in this manner, the three antiphons were incorporated into the Divine Liturgy and in order also again to gain time the proskomidē was transferred before their commencement. The proskomidē now developed more freely without its duration being limited by the hymns of the Divine Liturgy, and the antiphons, since they lost their original practical meaning, began to be reduced, until they reached their present dimensions. In each of its transfers, the service of the proskomidē drew along with it, naturally, also the prayer of the prothesis. In its last transfer, namely, before "Blessed is the kingdom . . .," we find it in all the manuscripts from the eighth century onward and in all the standard rubrics and in the "Diataxeis of the Divine Liturgy." After the priest completed the service of the proskomidē, the Divine Liturgy began. "The complete proskomidē is done in the beginning and 'Blessed is the kingdom' is proclaimed to our God" (Theodōros the Stoudite, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts*).[826]

The prayer of the prothesis was preserved in its original place, namely, during the Cherubic hymn, only in the hierarchical Liturgy. The hierarch does not enter the bēma except only at the ancient entrance, the old beginning of the Liturgy. And nowadays he enters the bēma around the end of Matins, at lauds, in order to be vested, since the skeuophylakion is housed in the bēma, but goes out again

826. PG 99:1689c. Saint Theodōros the Stoudite (759–826) was a major monastic figure and opponent of iconoclasm, who is attributed many works, including extensive hymnography.

in order to observe the beginning of the Liturgy from the main part of the temple. This is more obvious in present practice when the hierarch is vested in the middle of the temple. The hierarch completes the proskomidē and recites the prayer of the prothesis during the cheroubikon. This is a survival of the most ancient practice.

Some priests have the habit of reading the prayer of the prothesis during the cheroubikon. It is not plausible for us to accept that the most ancient practice was locally preserved since we saw that already in the eighth century the prayer of the prothesis was found before "Blessed is the kingdom . . .." Rather, this is about an imitation of the hierarchical practice. Perhaps practical reasons also contributed, which they also invoke. The fact, namely, that the faithful arrive late to the temple, offer prosphores, and give names to be commemorated. They collect all these names and during the cheroubikon additionally commemorate them and excise the particles, then cover the holy elements, and say the prayer of the prothesis.[827] From a certain point of view, they are right. However, due to this transfer, on the one hand there is an undesirable prolongation of the cheroubikon, and on the other hand the precious gifts are left uncovered and exposed for a long time. The names of those who are late could be commemorated during the diptychs after the consecration, and the particles for the living and the dead can be excised in a future Liturgy. The correct taxis provides for the covering of the gifts and the full completion of the proskomidē, consequently also the reading of the prayer of the prothesis, before the enarxis of the Divine Liturgy.

240

During the service of the Paraklēsis, must the first antiphon of the anabathmoi of the fourth tone be chanted?

The service of the Paraklēsis has been arranged in imitation of the service of Matins. Namely, it is an abbreviated and slightly peculiar Matins for the Mother of God. By analogy with it, we could also

827. Phountoulēs is referring to an accommodation of those faithful that bring prosphora after the start of the Liturgy, even at times after the Scripture readings, usually with paper lists of names placed on top of the loaves, which often end up in piles near or even on the prothesis in the sanctuary.

have anabathmoi if the imitation was based on the festal Matins, or even not, if the weekday Matins was taken as a basis.

A divergence between the Hōrologia and the Euchologia as to this point is observed in the printed tradition of the service of the Paraklēsis. The Hōrologia, at least as many as I was able to see (editions of Venice 1855, Constantinople 1900, Athens 1915, Apostolikē Diakonia 1957 and 1963), have the first antiphon of the fourth tone in between a kontakion and prokeimenon. In contrast, the Euchologia and the Hagiasmataria, which follow them, immediately after the kontakion add, "And immediately the prokeimenon, 'I will remember your name . . .,'[828]" namely, they do not provide for the chanting of the anabathmoi (Great Euchologion, edition of Venice 1760, 1832; Hagiasmatarion, edition of Venice 1869, and Athens without a year). The first antiphon of the anabathmoi of the fourth tone was introduced from the Hōrologion into the edition of the Great Euchologion of M. Saliveros (Athens 1927) and from there into the Small Euchologion of the Apostolikē Diakonia (Athens 1963). It is well known that the Hōrologia represent the monastic liturgical tradition, while indeed the Euchologia lean toward the parish practice. It is very probable that the tradition of the Euchologia even at this point is more archaic, although we could not confirm it from the study of the manuscript tradition. Perhaps the anabathmoi were added later in order for the service of the Paraklēsis, as to this point, to be also made similar to the festal monastic Matins, namely, in order for it be performed more festively by imitation of the latter.

However, in practice this did not become prevalent, since indeed the anabathmoi do not have anything more spėcific that connects them to the canon of the Paraklēsis to the Mother of God.

828. "Μνησθήσομαι τοῦ ὀνόματός σου . . ."

241

During the Paraklēsis, where must the petitions be said; before the holy table, before the icon of the Lord, or before the icon of the Theotokos?

The petitions are directed to God in Trinity. This is also obvious from the exclamation that accompanies them: "For you are a merciful God who loves humankind and to you do we offer up glory, to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit . . .."[829] If the priest must turn to somewhere during their recitation—because many petitions and prayers even nowadays are said according to the ancient taxis, by the priest looking toward the people—this would be determined by what we noted above. Namely, it will not be correct for the priest to be turned toward the icon of the Theotokos because the petitions, in contrast to the troparia, are not addressed to the Panagia. It would be a lesser mistake for him to be turned toward the icon of Christ. Many prayers, such as for example the prayers of Matins and the one behind the ambōn, which are addressed to God the Father, are said nowadays, perhaps not dogmatically correctly, before the icon of Christ. This could somewhat be justified from the saying of the Lord, "He who has seen me, has seen the Father" (John 14:9). Despite all this, I think it is more correct for them to be said before the beautiful gate or before the altar, toward which—the earthly throne of God in Trinity—the prayers of the saints rise.

242

Is "May He who was born in a cave . . . and rose from the dead . . ."[830] said in the dismissal of proskomidē during Sunday, or only "May He who rose from the dead . . ."[831]?

The dismissal in the service of proskomidē is a very modern element which, as far as I know, is not encountered in a manuscript older than the fourteenth century. It appears that the proskomidē up until

829. "Ὅτι ἐλεήμων καὶ φιλάνθρωπος Θεὸς ὑπάρχεις, καὶ σοὶ τὴν δόξαν ἀναπέμπομεν, τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ καὶ τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι . . ."

830. "Ὁ ἐν σπηλαίῳ γεννηθείς . . . καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν . . ."

831. "Ὁ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν . . ."

then ended with the prayer of the prothesis. The first evidence for the addition of the dismissal is given by the *Diataxis* of Philotheos (fourteenth century), which adds after the prayer: "and after this, the priest himself after censing the prothesis also says the dismissal on the spot" (*Codex Panteleēmonos 6277-770*).[832] The form for the beginning of the dismissal is specified in relatively very late manuscripts from the sixteenth century onward. We quote the dismissal according to the codices of *National Library of Athens 766, 751, 770, 771, 773,* and *765*: "And this is the dismissal: And if it is Sunday, he says, 'May He who rose from the dead, Christ our true God . . ..' But if any other day, in this way: 'May Christ our true God . . . .'" The same form is also maintained, as far as I know, in all the manuscripts and in the old, but also in the newer printed editions of the Hieratika and Euchologia.

Under the form, "May He who was born in a cave and laid in a manger for our salvation . . ." for weekdays and with this additional phrase on Sundays, "and who rose from the dead,"[833] it is presented for the first time, from as much as I could determine, in the printed editions of M. Saliveros, edited by N. Papadopoulos. In the Euchologion, it is placed in a footnote, while in the text the traditional one is preserved, "May Christ our true God . . ." (Athens 1927, p. 31, footnote 1: "In this way, usually: 'May He who was born in a cave and laid in a manger for our salvation [but if it is Sunday, this is also said, 'and who rose from the dead'] Christ our true God . . .'"[834]). In the Hieratikon, this is completely adopted and is introduced into the text of the dismissal (*The Divine Liturgy* . . . G. Karyophylēs–N. Papadopoulos, p. 33: "May He who was born [in] a cave . . . [but if it is a Sunday, he says: 'and who arose from the dead'] Christ our true God . . .'").[835]

---

832. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 6.

833. "καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν . . ."

834. Ν. Π. Παπαδόπουλος, ed., *Εὐχολόγιον τὸ Μέγα* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1927), 31, n. 1. The word "but" is not in the note.

835. Ν. Π. Παπαδόπουλος and Γ. Καρυοφύλης, eds., *Ἡ Θεία Λειτουργία, περιέχουσα τὸν Ἑσπερινόν, τὸν Ὄρθρον, τὴν Προσκομιδήν, Τὰς Τρεῖς Λειτουργίας Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου, Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου, καὶ τῶν Προηγιασμένων ὡς*

The above dismissal has the characteristic of the dismissal for the feast of the Nativity of Christ. It is well known that the modern symbolism of the proskomidē associates it with the birth of Christ. To this, is owed the introduction of the phrase, "And the star came and stood over where the child was"[836] that accompanies the placement of the asteriskos, and the icon of the Nativity that in very recent years is located or painted in the alcove of the proskomidē. This symbolism is more modern and entirely secondary. Inasmuch as also the reliable printed editions of the liturgical books remain faithful to the old correct form of the beginning of the dismissal ("May Christ our true God . . ." or "May He who rose from the dead, Christ . . ." for Sundays), we should not deviate from it.

We will return to the subject of the symbolism of the proskomidē in connection with another question that refers especially to it.

243

When the hierarch presides outside the bēma,[837] when does the priest take "kairos"?

244

When the priest has taken "kairos" from the hierarch, does he bless his vestments when vesting?

245

When the hierarch presides outside the bēma on the throne, during the doxology, would the priest come out of the holy bēma and ask a blessing from him while saying "It is time for the Lord to act"[838]?

καὶ πολλὰ ἄλλα χρήσιμα εἰς τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ διακόνους (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, n.d.), 33. The word "but" is not in the parenthetical note.

836. The phrase is derived from Matthew 2:10–11.

837. The verb, "χοροστατέω," literally means, "I lead the choir," but will be translated here as "I preside outside the bēma" when referring to the bishop presiding on his throne next to the choir as opposed to actually officiating or serving the Divine Liturgy from the holy sanctuary.

838. "Καιρὸς τοῦ ποιῆσαι τῷ Κυριῷ . . ." (Ps. 118:126).

246

At every exclamation, before and after it, does the priest make an inclination to the hierarch?

247

When the hierarch presides outside the bēma during the Liturgy, does he receive the holy gifts during the great entrance and commemorate?

248

During the reception of the hierarch in the middle of Matins, do all the priests go out for his reception or must one of them remain in the temple for the service?[839]

This column is addressed to priests. Questions and answers that pertain to the liturgical duties of the hierarchs do not belong here. For this reason, up until now, we avoided replying to questions from parish priests that referred to hierarchical liturgical deontology. We will not observe this principle above in this answer and we ask pardon in advance from as many of the hierarchs that happen to read the lines below. This is done for two reasons: First, the subject of presiding outside the bēma is connected immediately with the liturgical duties of the priests, given that they officiate when the hierarch presides outside the bēma. And second, because the first four questions were submitted not by one, but by many priests who formulated them in a clergy synaxis and are directly useful for them because they serve in a large city and frequently encounter these and similar problems.

839. The questions are inserted before each part of this answer for clarity.

During the reception of the hierarch in the middle of Matins, do all the priests go out for his reception or must one of them remain in the temple for the service?

We begin with the last question. The hierarch comes into the temple, as is well known, during the reading of the kontakion and the synaxarion. It is consistent with the prevailing taxis, for the sake of honor for the hierarch and even for the sake of polite behavior, that all the priests receive him at the temple's entrance, where there will be found the dibamboulon,[840] the pastoral staff, and the mandyas that the hierarch will put on when about to preside outside of the bēma. The difficulty for some priests on this point consists in the otherwise pious custom, which they view as an inviolable, as it were, law, that once they enter the bēma and vest with the epitrachēlion, they do not remove it and do not exit from the sanctuary except only when about to cense and take "kairos," namely, according to the instances delineated by the Typikon, and not be absent from the synaxis, which would leaderless during their absence. Without wishing to encourage the priests' needless wanderings inside the temple during the chanting of the service, and much more their exit from it during the service, we must remember the most accurate practice of the Holy Mountain, according to which the priest remains in his stasidion[841] outside of the bēma during the services and puts on his

840. "διβάμβουλον" (dibamboulon), a golden lamp, candlestick, or two-branched candelabrum that precedes a hierarch. Phountoulēs does not precisely identify this term. For a discussion of the dibamboulon, see Vassa Larin, *The Byzantine Hierarchical Divine Liturgy in Arsenij Suxanov's Proskinitawrij,* OCA 286 (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Orientale, 2010), 240–250; and Elena Velkovska, "The Pontifical Diataxis 'according the Rite of the Great Church' (London, British Library Add. 34060). A New Edition," *Studi sull'Oriente Cristiano* 24 (2020): 115–150.

841. "στασίδιον, τό (pl., στασίδια, τά)." Here, the term "stasidion" (pl., stasidia) refers to a seat in a monastic chapel or church. In question 557, Phountoulēs states regarding their construction in modern monasteries, "For the synaxes, the worshipers invented stasidia, which, when properly constructed, such as for example on the Holy Mountain, are a marvel of knowledge of the human body's anatomy. They enable propping up the one praying when he stands upright, supporting him in a half-seated posture, and relaxing him when he is seated." Such seats are also designed to allow the worshipper when seated to rest his or her head on the arm rest.

epitrachēlion only when he is about to enter the bēma or to say what belongs to him and removes it again in order to return to his place. The reception of the hierarch is also itself an element of all the liturgical expressions and practices that are provided for concerning the hierarchical presiding outside the bēma. Moreover, the priests would not be abandoning the temple and the synaxis in order to wander the streets and squares while awaiting the arrival of the hierarch, but rather in a worthy manner would receive him with all honor and dignity, before the temple's entrance.

The answer to the series of the other questions depends upon the position that we take on a preliminary question: Is the hierarch's presiding outside the bēma during the Divine Liturgy proper and liturgically well-ordered? Unfortunately, we are not able to give an affirmative answer to this fundamental question in point. Our liturgical tradition always desires that the hierarch is one standing in the place of Christ, who sanctifies and who is not sanctified by the priest. Because, even if the hierarch is found in a prominent place and presides over the synaxis and blesses the people, the one who officiates, offers the sacrifice, and consecrates the precious gifts and through them the fullness of the Church, is the one who sanctifies and is essentially first. The type of the great Archpriest here, who sanctifies, will be possessed by him who by the power of the archpriesthood of Christ and by the grace of the Holy Spirit is vested in "the grace of the priestly office." He will pray to God on behalf of the people here present.[842] Who will be the Archpriest in this case? One of the people? But he is not, given that as archpriest he is present at and presides over the synaxis. A hierarch? But given that another one acts in the place of the great Archpriest, Christ, and officiates? Therefore, the tradition correctly does not know a hierarch's presiding outside the bēma during the Divine Liturgy. Whenever the hierarch is present, he serves; otherwise, he is not officially present. The Liturgy either is the highest work of the Church and of its hierarch and he celebrates it, or it is not, and he entrusts its celebration to a second person. The father, the "presider," the "first" celebrates the mystery,

842. With the words, "the people here present" (τοῦ περιεστῶτος λαοῦ), Phountoulēs is referring to a petition from the ektenēs of the Divine Liturgy.

prepares the soul-nourishing table, and welcomes the Church, just as Christ celebrated the mystical supper and welcomed his apostles.

Nevertheless, the present practice recognizes the establishment of the hierarch's presiding outside the bēma during the Divine Liturgy. It must be an invention of the last years of the Tourkokratia.[843] How and for what reasons it was introduced we are not in a position to know. In any case, if I am not mistaken, the first and only formal systematic description[844] of it in a liturgical book exists in the publication of the *Hierotelestikon* of Chrysostomos of Philippi and Neapolis, afterwards archbishop of Athens (Athens 1948, pp. 238–248).[845] Certainly, the Archbishop of blessed memory did not invent the presiding outside the bēma but recorded an existing practice. It is true that divine worship legitimately develops, and it is not necessary for a practice, which is in existence nowadays, to necessarily have a lifespan of two thousand years. But, as we wrote many times, the present practice is judged by examination of the old one, which gives us the criterion for the correctness of the new one. Otherwise, we cannot speak regarding worship being passed down and developing in an orthodox manner. In any case, the writer especially rejoices because in a most new splendid publication of the Archieratikon, which was done by the Church of Greece (Athens 1971), after long study of its manifold problems, no standard rubric for a hierarch presiding outside the bēma during the Divine Liturgy was included and thus, an irregularly established regime did not receive the anointing of legitimization.

We come to the response for the series of questions. From the liturgical impasse that each time arises during the search for a correct practice, the liturgical disorder of the hierarch presiding outside the

843. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

844. "κατάστρωσις" (Dēmētrakos, s.v. "κατάστρωσις, ἡ").

845. Χρυσόστομος Φιλίππων καὶ Νεαπόλεως, *Ἱεροτελεστικόν* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1948), 238–248. In the text above, the mistaken reference, "241–248," is corrected.

bēma during the Divine Liturgy will be confirmed, just as the traditional saying concerning countless evils that follow the one.

When the hierarch presides outside the bēma, when does the priest take "kairos"?

1) When does the priest take "kairos"? After the entrance of the hierarch and his ascent to the despotikon,[846] the priest with the deacon make a prostration and kiss his hand when they are blessed by him. Inasmuch as the hierarch will be the celebrant during the Liturgy that will follow, they will vest without taking "kairos," namely, while not saying the usual service. The hierarch will take "kairos" during lauds. However, what if he only presides outside the bēma? The priest will be the celebrant, consequently, according to the prevailing taxis, he ought to perform the relevant service of "kairos."[847] The prostration to the bishop cannot replace it, inasmuch as this prostration would take place regardless, namely, when the hierarch is present or absent, in the monasteries both before the abbot–presider or before his empty stasidion.[848] From the performance of this preparatory service of "kairos," through which he will seek strength from on high for the celebration of the bloodless sacrifice, the hierarch is not exempt, much more so the priest.

However, when will the priest take kairos while the hierarch is also present? After his arrival, the katabasies are chanted, then the ninth ode, lauds, and the doxology. Sufficient time perhaps does not remain for the priest to take kairos, vest, perform the proskomidē, cense during the ninth ode, recite the usual petitions for the end of Matins and its dismissal, moreover if it is Sunday, to read the eōthinon gospel reading and to exit for the kiss. It would obviously be preferable for him to take "kairos" before the arrival of the bishop,

---

846. The episcopal throne located in the nave outside of the sanctuary.

847. This is the point where Phountoulēs makes a distinction between a hierarch who presides outside the bēma (χοροστάτης) and the actual celebrant (λειτουργός) of the Divine Liturgy, who will be the priest in this case. See also question 517 where a similar distinction is also made.

848. Here, Phountoulēs is showing the analogous practice in the monasteries when the abbot–presider is not present.

although ordinarily the prostration to the presider or the throne of the bishop precedes "kairos." Here, irregularly, it will follow.

When the priest has taken "kairos" from the hierarch, does he bless his vestments when vesting?

2) I do not see the reason for which the prostration to the bishop would release the priest from the obligation to bless and to recite the traditional lines during the putting on of his sacred vestments. If the hierarch will celebrate, perhaps a relevant discussion point could perhaps be raised, though I do not think that the answer even in this case must be different than the former.

When the hierarch presides outside the bēma on the throne, during the doxology, would the priest come out of the holy bēma and ask a blessing from him while saying "It is time for the Lord to act"[849]?

3) "It is time for the Lord to act," is said by the deacon to the celebrating priest. The deacon seeks permission (the "blessing"[850]) from him to take part in the sacred-service—we have analogous elements at other places of our Liturgies and in the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos—and the deacon asks the priest to "remember him"[851] during the prayers of the Divine Liturgy. Specifically, in the hierarchical Divine Liturgy, the deacon is found near the hierarch, at the despotikon, and it is natural, provided that he is the celebrant, to receive the blessing from him. However, during the presiding outside the bēma, he does not serve. He gave general "permission"[852] when the celebrants, a priest and a deacon, received his blessing when he entered the temple and ascended the throne. The same thing also applies for the blessing of the deacon before the gospel reading, which the rubric of presiding outside the bēma from the *Hierotelestikon* (pp. 245–246) provides for. The impropriety of the matter is also cer-

849. "Καιρὸς τοῦ ποιῆσαι τῷ Κυριῷ . . ." (Ps. 118:126).
850. "εὐλογία."
851. "μνησθῇ αὐτοῦ."
852. "ἄδεια."

tainly apparent from the fact that the deacon seeks a blessing for the "herald of the gospel"[853] while holding the censer.

At every exclamation, before and after it, does the priest make an inclination to the hierarch?

4) The *Hierotelestikon* above provides for an inclination ("a schēma"[854]) toward the hierarch presiding outside the bēma only when the deacon prays on his behalf in the litany of peace, and the priest says, "Among the first."[855] The priest making a schēma before and after every exclamation and the deacon, by analogy, before and after every synaptē or his intervention in the Liturgy, is inconceivable and contrary to the solemnity and dignity of the celebration, but even to basic human dignity. I think an even worst-case scenario was the one of which the writer was also an eyewitness, when in a hierarchical presiding outside the bēma the celebrants abandoned the sanctuary during the cheroubikon and the koinōnikon and came out in full vestments before the throne to make a "prostration" to the hierarch.

On the other hand, a schēma to the hierarch is justified in the hierarchical Liturgy in order for the priests to say the exclamations of the antiphons while the hierarch is found outside during the beginning of the Liturgy, because they act on behalf of him who is the celebrant and who says the prayers of the antiphons.

When the hierarch presides outside the bēma during the Liturgy, does he receive the holy gifts during the great entrance and commemorate?

5) The *Hierotelestikon* provides, during the great entrance, that "the deacon, after he arrives before the hierarchical throne, exclaims, while turning toward the hierarch, 'May the Lord God remember your archpriesthood . . .'[856]; and likewise, the priest, and they enter the bēma." The commemoration during the great entrance of the

853. "εὐαγγελιστοῦ."
854. "σχῆμα."
855. "Ἐν πρώτοις μνήσθητι . . ."
856. "Τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης σου μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεός . . ."

hierarch, of the concelebrants or priests present, or of the abbot in the monasteries is encountered in the manuscripts. For example, in the codices of the *National Library of Athens 766* from the sixteenth century and *765* from the eighteenth century, "If there is a hierarch, he[857] also says this while looking toward him,[858] praying on his behalf, [and] both the deacon and the priest [respond]: 'May the Lord God remember your archpriesthood in his kingdom.' In a similar fashion, the priest also exclaims this . . .."[859] And nowadays, on the Holy Mountain, the priests, when entering the bēma, pray in a loud voice for the other priests who are present, "May the Lord God remember your priesthood . . .."[860] However, from this point up until the point that the hierarch receives the holy gifts and commemorates, a great distance exists.

249

During the catechesis, can the Symbol of Faith be said once or necessarily three times as the Euchologion mentions?

According to the manuscript and printed Euchologia, the Symbol of Faith is said three times. According to Symeōn of Thessaloniki, the one being baptized, or the sponsor on his/her behalf, "clearly enunciates the complete confession of the Sacred Symbol. And he does this three times while confirming the confession at the same time also in honor . . . of the Trihypostatic Divinity" (*Dialogue*, chapter

857. The hierarch.

858. The priest.

859. As it appears in Trempelas, the full text reads, "Εἰ δὲ μόνος ἐστὶν ὁ ἱερεύς, λέγει οὕτως: Μνησθείη πάντων ἡμῶν, [o, w], Εἰ δὲ ἔστιν ἀρχιερεύς, λέγει καὶ τοῦτο βλέπων πρὸς αὐτόν, εὐχόμενος ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ, ὅ τε διάκονος καὶ ὁ ἱερεύς: Μνησθείη, Κύριος ὁ Θεός, τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης σου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ. Ὁμοίως ἐκφωνεῖ καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦτο: Μνησθείη, Κύριος ὁ Θεός, τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης σου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ πάντοτε νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων," Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι κατὰ τοὺς ἐν Ἀθήναις κώδικας*, Texte und Forschungen zur Byzantinisch–Neugriechischen Philologie no. 15 (Ἀθῆναι: Ἡ ἐπιστημονικὴ ἐπιτροπὴ πρὸς ἀναθεώρησιν καὶ ἔκδοσιν τῶν λειτουργικῶν βιβλίων, 1935), 82. The letters "o" and "w" signify the two manuscripts, *National Library of Athens 766* and *765*, respectively. The parenthetical words were added to the translation for clarity.

860. "Τῆς ἱερωσύνης σου μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεός . . ."

62).[861] It is obvious that the triple repetition is due to the reasons above. But originally it was probably not said three times in the same day. The pre-baptismal ceremonies were done in recurrent synaxes of catechumens; perhaps the triple repetition also aimed at a better learning of the Symbol. This reason does not exist nowadays because, at least hypothetically, the sponsors know it well.

However, it must be noted that the exorcisms were also not said solely one time, as nowadays, but at least three times, as certain standard rubrics even require. According to the codices of *Sinai 996* and *Koutloumousiou 343*, the five preparatory prayers were said "eight or ten times." According to Symeōn of Thessaloniki, "if indeed there is an opportunity, one must say the prayers from the beginning of the exorcisms and the other prayers not only once, but many times. For also in the Euchologion it is written that they are said eight or ten times, because it also was an ancient custom of the Church every day in seven days for these to be said by the catechizing priests for the ones being baptized, and on the eighth day again by the hierarch or the priest about to baptize; and in this way they were baptized by the hierarch or priest; and we see pious priests who say these things three times without exception and in this way baptize" (*Dialogue*, chapter 61).[862] The course of the matter is clear. From the "eight or ten times" of the ancient Euchologia, when the baptismal practices were concentrated into one day the number began to be reduced to "many times"—if there was time ("if an opportunity")—to three times and finally, to once. From as much as Symeōn says, it appears that many priests did not say the prayers three times, but once. Finally, this also became prevalent, after indeed also a synodal decision during the reign of Patriarch Iōannēs of Constantinople (1276) ratified it ("the priest must say the prayers one time").[863]

---

861. PG 155:220a–220b.

862. PG 155:212d.

863. Μανουὴλ Ἰ. Γεδεών, *Κανονικαὶ Διατάξεις, Ἐπιστολαί, Λύσεις, Θεσπίσματα, τῶν Ἁγιωτάτων Πατριαρχῶν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἀπὸ Γρηγορίου τοῦ Θεολόγου μέχρι Διονυσίου τοῦ ἀπὸ Ἀδριανουπόλεως* (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1888), 1:17. The mistaken date of 1376 is corrected in the translated text to 1276. The "decision" took place under Patriarch Iōannēs XI (Bekkos), (r. 1275–1282), and is contained in a synodal

The recitation of the Symbol of Faith also follows the same path. The single recitation already tends to become widespread. And this could not be characterized as a "novelty" since the example of the exorcisms had preceded.

250

During concelebration, is the prayer, "O Lord, stretch forth your hand . . ."[864] said in the plural number?[865]

The subject of priestly concelebration presents many difficulties, both theoretical and practical. We did not want to expand upon this subject because it will occupy us in another answer in connection with a question that refers to the thorny issue itself of blessings. The solution for all these things depends on the basic question whether there are many celebrants or only one celebrant of the mystery and in what sense must the concelebration of the remaining ones be understood. However, passing over this subject, we come to the question whether the prayer, "O Lord, stretch forth . . . ," must be turned into a plural form in the case of a concelebration.

A precisely similar question could be posed regarding the prayer of the Cherubic hymn, "No one is worthy . . . ,"[866] which is also composed in the singular. All the other prayers of the Divine Liturgy, both of Chrysostomos and of Basileios the Great, even the central prayer of the anaphora, are composed in the plural and it is clear, at the very least in most places, that the deacon or the people are not only understood, but that more than one priest is being referred to. Furthermore, let it be noted that both these prayers do not belong to the original text of the Divine Liturgy, but while the first one, of the "kairos," is far more modern, the older one, "No one is

---

response to twelve questions submitted by the bishop of Sarai (in the Crimea). A description of the questions and responses is contained in *Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarchat de Constantinople*, 1427.

864. "Κύριε ἐξαπόστειλόν μοι τὴν χεῖρά σου . . ."

865. The question concerns those sections of the central prayer in the service of "kairos" (which is said when preparing to celebrate the Divine Liturgy) that refer to the priest individually.

866. "Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος . . ."

worthy . . . ," comes on loan from another Liturgy, the Alexandrian Liturgy of Grēgorios the Theologian.[867]

However, regardless of this question, which is not without importance for the understanding that is given to concelebration perhaps according to the various liturgical traditions or periods, the reality is one, that today both these prayers belong to our Liturgy and are composed in the singular. Even if we still do not accept that there is one primary celebrant and that these prayers (they are both preparatory and the later prayer of "kairos" is a duplication of the first) pertain to him, the prayers can be viewed as also referring to all the concelebrants, and either the one recites them in the name of all, or also the others mentally participate in the offering of these prayers, together reciting in some manner mystically or mentally. The same also happens as regards to the "I believe . . . ,"[868] and the prayers of the services of the daily cycle, which are composed in the singular and are recited by one individual in the name of the community praying together.

A change of the two prayers in question to a plural is neither attested to by tradition, nor even easy grammatically, especially regarding the prayer, "No one is worthy . . .."

251

Are the three exclamations, "Take, eat . . . ,"[869] "Drink of it, all . . . ,"[870] and "Your own of your own . . . ,"[871] said by the first in rank?

In the case of a concelebration, the various exclamations of the Divine Liturgy are assigned among the concelebrating priests according to their importance. Specifically, the first two exclamations from the question are provided for by all the rubrics to be said by the first in rank, and very correctly, given that they are the words of institution for the mystery. "Your own of your own," when a hierarch is serving,

867. See question 200 for sources regarding this Liturgy.
868. Namely, the Symbol of Faith, the creed.
869. "Λάβετε, φάγετε . . ."
870. "Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες . . ."
871. "Τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν . . ."

is said by the second of the priests. In priestly concelebrations, by the third.

The Hieratikon of the Apostolikē Diakonia (1962) requires all three to be said by the first. I think that this rubric must be placed in the whole framework of the tendency toward the elevation of this exclamation, which tends to bear the theological weight for the offering of the precious gifts because a participle ("προσφέροντες," offering) was transformed into an indicative ("προσφέρομεν," we offer).[872] In the same tendency must be sought the same reason for which, while according to the standard rubrics of the printed editions the deacon raises the gifts at this exclamation, many priests and even hierarchs themselves raise the gifts during this exclamation.

However, aside from the discussion of its place—the invocation of the Holy Spirit is the center of the eucharistic prayer and not the exclamation, "Your own of your own . . ."—not only do the concelebrating priests participate in the exclamations but also the people themselves, who chant phrases belonging to the prayer itself, such as "Holy, holy, holy . . .," "Amen," and "We hymn you . . .."[873] At this loftiest point of the life of the Church, all its members, hierarch–concelebrating priests–deacon–people, work together and are joined together into one, and this brotherhood in Christ is revealed by the hierarchical participation of all in the anaphora of the sacrifice.

252

During Renewal Week, does the priest take "kairos" and does he say "Christ is risen"[874] when vesting instead of the verses?

I do not know any rubric existing that refers to this subject. During Renewal Week the stichologia of psalms and biblical odes, and so forth, is suspended and the penitential troparia are not chanted. The service of "kairos" has three well-known ones that could be omitted. But as a preparatory service, certainly with the special prayer that it contains, it is indispensable for the preparation of the celebrant for

872. Phountoulēs is alluding to his extensive discussion of this point in question 200.

873. "Σὲ ὑμνοῦμεν . . ."

874. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη . . ."

the performance of the Divine Eucharist. Moreover, also during the great Paschal Liturgy of the vigil for Pascha, the priest, according to what prevails, takes "kairos" during the chanting of the canon of Great Saturday. If one invokes the well-known rubric that the whole week "is reckoned as one day" and consequently the priest also took "kairos" once during the first Liturgy, is it unnecessary to also take "kairos" during the others? But with the same logical principle, the celebration of the services of Vespers and Matins, and the Divine Liturgy itself, ought to be excluded for the whole Renewal Week. In any case, given that among us the Divine Liturgy is attached to Matins and that the priest wears full vestments during the enarxis of Matins, he ought to take "kairos" and vest before the words, "Glory to the holy and consubstantial . . .."[875]

The same things more or less also apply to the verses that accompany the putting on of the vestments. Much more so where they do not have a penitential character. No one says to us that they are not said during Pascha. On the contrary, they are always located at the beginning of our liturgical books for the Divine Liturgy which, no matter what day of the year it is celebrated, we must not forget that it is a preeminent Paschal expression of the Church, a repetition of the annual Pascha.

253

Is "Come receive the light . . ."[876] said only on Pascha or throughout Renewal Week?

The igniting and spreading of light while "Come receive the light . . ." is chanted during the all-night vigil of Pascha is a very modern custom, since it is not mentioned even by the printed Pentēkostaria. It has been established in imitation of the service of the "holy light" of the temple of the All-holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. Proof of its modern introduction into the service of the Resurrection is that it did not manage to be incorporated within it, but rather it is done in a liturgically dead time, namely, between the dismissal of the service

875. "Δόξα τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ ὁμοουσίῳ . . ."
876. "Δεῦτε λάβετε φῶς . . ."

of the Midnight Office and the blessing of the enarxis for the service of Matins.

During Renewal Week, the service of Pascha is chanted every day, but the service of light is not repeated, which, as we said, not only does not even belong to the ancient form, but neither also to the modern form of the Paschal service, since it is celebrated before it.

254

Can a baptism of three or four babies be done at the same time?

255

Where must the baptism of adults be done?

The practice of the ancient church recognized only as an exception for reasons of necessity the baptism of individual persons. During the era of its zenith, a systematic preparation of catechumens was done, with special catechesis and prayers for them, the exorcisms were read, the Symbol of Faith and the Lord's Prayer were taught to them, and holy baptism was collectively done during great feasts and especially during Pascha and Theophany. During the baptisms, the entire Church was present in a festal synaxis that was crowned by the Divine Liturgy and holy communion, which constitute the culmination of Christian initiation and the practice of incorporation of all the faithful by this into the Body of Christ.

In all the old manuscript Euchologia, the prayers and standard rubrics for the mystery of baptism are found in the plural. And in our present Euchologia, we can discern in the plural the remnants of these ancient forms.

However, with the passage of the centuries and the complete prevalence of infant baptism, we arrived slowly from group to individual baptism. On the one hand, infant mortality and the fear that they might die "unillumined" contributed to this, and on the other hand, during the centuries of slavery, the fear of unbelievers and the dangers in general that afflicted the Church at that time

also contributed. In practice, the service of holy baptism fell into such decline—let us not be afraid to admit the truth—that its present-day celebration is a shadow of its old form. Without anyone denying that in some places the damage is less, generally the image, which its celebration presents in many places by many priests, is so disappointing that no one can hope for its restoration other than by an active and well-thought-out intervention of ecclesiastical authority, which would restore the appropriate taxis to the mystery of Christian initiation.

One of the elements of tradition that must be revived is also collective baptism. The danger of death for infants has nowadays, thanks to the advances of medicine, been reduced to a minimum. If there is not a special reason, baptism could be celebrated in combination with the great feasts, as it was before. Or at least, until we reach this ideal, the baptisms of the month or even of the week could be concentrated into one common baptismal synaxis on a Sunday, for example, in the afternoon. It would be a celebration of a large or small parish during which its new members would be received. If baptism could certainly be celebrated according to the correct ancient taxis, to be celebrated within the Divine Liturgy or even immediately after it and to be combined with the holy communion of the newly illumined, but even of the relatives and the other faithful, just as the old practice requires, the whole service would be restored to its ancient framework.

However, where the collective celebration of baptism is imperative are the large cities. The large parishes of cities nowadays have populations much greater than their prewar ones and are called to serve the liturgical needs of so many people that dozens of parishes would not be physically sufficient to cover them. It was natural for the Church to find itself in a difficult position and to be caught unprepared for the great change. In divine worship and especially in the service of holy baptism, which is at issue, the repercussions are more obvious, for this reason also the correction is especially urgent. Fortunately, home baptisms, which changed baptism into a family affair, have disappeared. But our temples, in which whole series of baptisms are now celebrated on Sundays, meet the new situation

with the same means and the same ways that they faced them during the era of Tourkokratia.[877] While glorious temples are built, apart from the offices and halls, and so forth, which are praiseworthily provided for in the new structures, no one thought to attach to them even one decent baptistery, with appropriate heating, with a stationary baptismal font with permanent infrastructure consisting of hot and cold water and a permanent drain. The portable baptismal fonts with buckets of hot and cold water and all those things that recall the home baptisms of the era of necessity, must give way to civilized contemporary baptisteries according to the model of the early Christian baptisteries. And instead of the service being corrupted with the celebration of a series of baptisms at a continually accelerated pace, it would be desirable that everything is done in one decent rite. In large cities, we saw services, which for obvious reasons, are choked into such tight time limits that it would not be possible for even one common sanctification of water to be fully celebrated. We also attended baptisms in which the participation of more than one priest, instead of conferring splendor to the sacred ceremony, contributed to its complete ruin, since one priest read the exorcisms, and the other sanctified the water, and while one baptized, the other read the prayers of chrismation, washing, and tonsure, and this because another baby was waiting or the celebration of a marriage or another service was next.

Particular attention is especially required concerning the baptism of adults. With infant baptism, we forgot the canonical manner for the celebration of the mystery, and we now do for adults whatever we do for babies. Inasmuch as we do not have special baptisteries and there is no immediate need, their baptism ought to be done in a season when its celebration would be possible to take place in a river, in the sea, or in a cistern. These things that we read or that we see in photographs, namely, the catechumen being baptized in a barrel or in a wash tub—long ago, one such photograph came to light with the newly illumined squatting in a wash tub, surrounded by

877. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

common water vessels of all shapes, and the priest "baptizing" from above—or next to a baptismal font, are unacceptable. The first contact of the new Christian with the mysteries of the Church usually takes place in a manner that approaches the boundaries of mockery. In these cases, conditions must be ensured for full triple immersion. At that time, especially the connection to the feasts, to the Divine Liturgy, and to the festive synaxis of the faithful and the collective and radiant celebration of the mystery is absolutely indispensable.

256

During the litany of peace, must the petition, "For pious and Orthodox Christians"[878] be said?[879]

Regarding the subject of the petition, "For pious and Orthodox Christians," which exists in the litany of peace and in the ektenēs, we made incidental mention of this in connection with the questions that referred to censing during the trisagion for the emperor in Matins and at "O Lord, save the pious"[880] of the hierarchical Liturgy (questions 211, 212, and 225).

It is beyond all doubt that this petition was introduced into our worship during the era of the Tourkokratia[881] as a replacement of the petition for the emperors. In the manuscripts before that era, this petition does not exist, and very correctly, because it does not belong to the original form of the synaptes/litanies or the ektenēs, and secondly because this accommodation of the structure and of the content of these supplications precludes an entreaty of such a content and in the place where it is found nowadays.

Namely, it appears that the litany of peace originally had three triplets of entreaties, according to the well-known beloved format that divine worship follows. After the introductory exhortation, "In

878. "Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν . . ."

879. For related discussions, see questions 189 (end of the answer), 212 (end of the answer), 225, 396 (where there is a brief reference regarding imperial polychronismoi), 417, and 588.

880. "Κύριε, σῶσον τοὺς εὐσεβεῖς."

881. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

peace, let us pray to the Lord,"[882] we have the first triplet with general entreaties (for the peace from above, for the peace of the whole world, and for this holy house), the second triplet with entreaties for persons (for the archbishop and clergy, for the emperor and army, and for the city and its inhabitants), and the third triplet has specific entreaties (for favorable weather . . ., for travelers by sea . . ., and for our deliverance . . .). Only that petition, "That He joins them in war . . .,"[883] creates a difficulty but it does not appear to have existed originally in the series of litanies (in any case, it exists in the *Codex Barberini* from the eighth century, which is the most ancient Byzantine Euchologion) or would be said combined with "For the most pious and God-protected emperors . . .,"[884] just as in the ektenēs. Hence, it appears that the triplet format of the great synaptē directly precludes from the outset the existence of an additional entreaty, in some manner, a stray one. Moreover, if an entreaty originally existed for Christians, namely, Christian people, it would be placed after the petition for the emperors and never before the petition for the archbishop. The same hierarchy is also observed in the petitions—diptychs—after the consecration of the precious gifts during the Divine Liturgy, which repeat the entreaties of the litany of peace and of the ektenēs with almost the same words (this is more distinct in the Liturgy of Chrysostomos).[885]

However, the entreaty for the people, "For pious and Orthodox Christians," precisely exists in its place in the series of entreaties in

882. "Ἐν εἰρήνῃ τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."

883. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ συμπολεμῆσαι [καὶ ὑποτάξαι ὑπὸ τούς πόδας αὐτῶν πάντα ἐχθρὸν καὶ πολέμιον, τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν]." Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336,* Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 150.12.

884. "Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ Θεοφυλάκτων βασιλέων ἡμῶν, [παντὸς τοῦ παλατίου καὶ τοῦ στρατοπέδου αὐτῶν, τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν]." Stefano Parenti and Elena Velkovska, eds. and trans., *L'Euchologio Barberini Gr. 336,* Bibliotheca "Ephemerides Liturgicae" "Subsidia" 80, 2nd ed. (Rome: C.L.V. – Edizioni Liturgiche, 2000), 150.11.

885. For a general study of the diptychs, see Robert F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom: Vol. IV, The Diptychs,* OCA 238 (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute, 1991).

the third one of the second triplet, where there is mention of cities, lands, "and those who with faith dwell therein."[886] The fact that the Christian Orthodox faith is meant with the qualifier, "with faith,"[887] is self-evident, but is also attested to by the parallel entreaty in the "catholic synaptē" of the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, where it is specified, "and for those who with Orthodox faith and reverence for God dwell therein."[888] Namely, the modern petition, "For pious and Orthodox Christians," essentially constitutes a repetition of the older petition for "those who dwell with faith" in the world.

The introduction of this entreaty took place, as we said, during the era of the Tourkokratia in replacement of the supplication for the emperors, for obvious reasons. We can also follow this in the manuscripts. In some, this is particularly clear, since "For pious and Orthodox Christians . . ." goes precisely in the position where the petition for the kings[889] is nowadays and the one that follows, "That He joins them in war . . .," is also preserved. However, these two are more customarily removed and replaced with "For pious and Orthodox Christians . . .." However, it is found nowadays before the petition for the archbishop, because in many manuscripts the supplication for the king precedes the supplication for the archbishop. When the petition for the emperor/king was brought back, the reason for the introduction of the petition, "For pious and Orthodox Christians . . .," had been forgotten, and just as often happens in divine worship, both also remained. Moreover, we saw that this also happened in "O Lord, save the emperors."[890]

The above also applies to the ektenēs, with the difference that its tradition is more fluid and the variations that it presents in the manuscripts and even in the printed editions are greater. In any case, also here special supplications exist and existed for "all pious and

886. "καὶ τῶν πίστει οἰκούντων ἐν αὐταῖς."

887. "πίστει."

888. "καὶ τῶν ὀρθοδόξῳ πίστει καὶ εὐλαβείᾳ Θεοῦ οἰκούντων ἐν αὐταῖς." B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 72.

889. At the time of this writing, Greece was a kingdom. The Greek word, "βασιλεύς," can be used for "king" or "emperor."

890. "Κύριε, σῶσον τοὺς βασιλεῖς."

Orthodox Christians," living and deceased. The supplication "For pious and Orthodox Christians" was also added here in replacement of "For our most pious and God-protected [or Christ-loving] emperors, for their dominion, victory, preservation, peace, health, and salvation . . .,"[891] which is found in precisely the same place, namely, before the supplication for the archbishop, just as also in the litany of peace. On the Holy Mountain, the supplication for the emperors, founders of the monasteries, is preserved. In any case, the replacement in the ektenēs was more radical because the supplication for the emperors did not return after the passing of the Tourkokratia, perhaps because in the meantime in the parishes it began to be omitted and its readjustment was not practically useful.

The same thing precisely also happens in, "Let us pray,"[892] of the Midnight Office and Compline, where the first petition after the petition of peace for the world, "For pious and Orthodox Christians" permanently replaced, as it appears, also here the one for the emperors, which is found in the manuscripts before the Fall.[893]

However, let it not be thought that these things that are noted above only pertain to the manuscripts. The same fluctuation is also observed in the printed editions. Here are some examples from as many liturgical books as happened to be on hand: "For pious and Orthodox Christians" does not exist in the litany of peace in the Great Euchologion, of the editions of Venice 1760 and 1832 and of Athens (Saliveros) 1927, in the Hieratikon ("The Divine Liturgies . . .") of the editions of Venice 1795, 1811, and 1848, and Athens (Saliveros) without a year of publication, and in the *Hierotelestikon* (Chrysostomos of Philippi), Athens 1948.[894] In the edition of the Liturgies (G. Prōtopsaltidēs), Athens 1865/Constantinople 1875, it is placed after the petition "For our Archbishop . . ." and before "That He joins them in war . . ." during Vespers, but during the Lit-

891. "Ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ Θεοφυλάκων (ἢ φιλοχρίστων) βασιλέων ἡμῶν, κράτους, νίκης, διαμονῆς, εἰρήνης, ὑγείας, σωτηρίας αὐτῶν . . ."

892. "Εὐξώμεθα."

893. The fall of Constantinople in 1453.

894. Χρυσόστομος Φιλίππων καὶ Νεαπόλεως, *Ἱεροτελεστικόν* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1948), 108.

urgy before the supplication "For our Archbishop . . .."[895] In the ektenēs of Vespers of the Great Euchologion of Venice 1760 and 1832, it does not exist, but it does exist in the ektenēs of the Divine Liturgy. In other editions, the petitions for the emperors exist parallel with the petition "For pious and Orthodox Christians . . .," yet in others they are omitted or placed within parentheses. Moreover, in the ektenēs of the Divine Liturgy of the *Hierotelestikon* the petition for the emperors is added, after, however, that for the archbishop, but "For pious and Orthodox Christians . . ." is removed.[896]

The compromise of tradition in the easiest way, but also in a less acceptable one, namely, the introduction of double supplications, was done in many modern, and certainly in not all, printed editions. Perhaps this is editorially and practically simpler, and for this reason tends to become prevalent. But, just as the retrospection showed, it is also not the most correct one.

257

In the litany of peace for the service of betrothal, two almost identical petitions exist. Must both be said?

Indeed, in the service of betrothal, we have two petitions that request the same thing with even the same words. We have, "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ φυλαχθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ καὶ βεβαίᾳ πίστει" (That they be preserved in concord and firm faith) and the one immediately fol-

895. Bibliographic information could not be found for the later Athens edition, but only for the earlier printing, Γεώργιος Κ. Πρωτοψαλτίδης, *Αἱ Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι τῶν ἐν Ἁγίοις Πατέρων ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου καὶ Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου σύν τῇ τῶν Προηγιασμένων, μετὰ τοῦ Λυχνικοῦ Ὄρθρου, καὶ τοῦ Ἱεροδιακονικοῦ, Ἀκριβῶς ἐπιθεωρηθεῖσαι καὶ πλουτισθεῖσαι δι' ὑποσημειώσεων περιέργων, παρὰ τοῦ παναγιωτάτου καὶ σεβασμιωτάτου Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ Α'. τοῦ ἀπὸ Σιναίου* (Ἀθῆναι: Π. Β. Μωραϊτίνη, 1865). For the printing in Constantinople, Ν. Κ. Πρωτοψαλτίδης, *Αἱ Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι τῶν ἐν Ἁγίοις Πατέρων ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου καὶ Βασιλείου τοῦ Μεγάλου σύν τῇ τῶν Προηγιασμένων, μετὰ τοῦ Λυχνικοῦ Ὄρθρου, καὶ τοῦ Ἱεροδιακονικοῦ, Ἀκριβῶς ἐπιθεωρηθεῖσαι καὶ πλουτισθεῖσαι δι' ὑποσημειώσεων περιέργων, παρὰ τοῦ παναγιωτάτου καὶ σεβασμιωτάτου Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ Α'. τοῦ ἀπὸ Σιναίου* (Κωνσταντινούπολις: ἐκ τοῦ Πατριαρχικοῦ Τυπογραφείου, 1875), 2, 87.

896. Χρυσόστομος Φιλίππων καὶ Νεαπόλεως, *Ἱεροτελεστικόν* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1948), 108.

lowing, "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ εὐλογηθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ καὶ βεβαίᾳ πίστει" (That they be blessed in concord and firm faith). Their difference consists in the verb, "φυλαχθῆναι" (to be preserved) and "εὐλογηθῆναι" (to be blessed). In other respects, they are precisely the same. But still, even the difference between the verbs is superficial. The preservation of the reciprocal faith and concord of the betrothed in both cases will be a result of the "blessing" (τῆς εὐλογίας) of God. It appears that the first verb is the one most appropriate in this case. "To bless" (εὐλογεῖν) is not customarily used with a similar sense in divine worship. This is the first element that raises certain suspicions for us, as to the exactitude of the correct tradition for this petition. Moreover, since we do not have anything similar in the parallels for the litanies of the other services of our liturgical form, namely, two petitions that differ only regarding one word, the question is reasonably raised that perhaps one of these petitions is a later addition that originated either from a duplication of the preceding one or from a bad copying of another entreaty, which began in the same way with which one of these two entreaties begins.

Retrospection into the manuscript tradition also reinforces this position. This double petition does not exist in any of the almost forty manuscripts from all periods that contain the litanies of betrothals, which are published by A. Dmitrievskii in his *Euchologia* (Kiev 1901),[897] and in the nearly equal number of manuscripts of the National Library of Athens, which Prof. P. Trempelas uses in the critical edition of the services of betrothal and marriage in his *Small Euchologion.*[898] In many, "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ φυλαχθῆναι . . ." (That they be preserved . . .) is omitted and "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ εὐλογηθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ καὶ βεβαίᾳ πίστει" (That they be blessed in concord and firm faith) exists alone. Others present a great variety. However, in many there exists a petition that begins in the same way that the second of the printed edition begins and does not exist in our printed Eucho-

897. А. А. Дмитриевский, *Εὐχολόγια*, vol. 2 of Описание литургическихъ рукописей, хранящихся въ библиотекахъ Православного Востока (Киев: Г. Т. Корчакъ-Новицкаго, 1901).

898. Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον*, 2 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: n.p., 1950–1955).

logia. This petition is borne in the manuscripts in different variants: "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ εὐλογηθῆναι τὰ μνῆστρα ταῦτα τῇ δυνάμει καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος" (That this betrothal be blessed by the power and energy of the Holy Spirit) (*Codices National Library of Athens 661, S. 724, Megistēs Lavras Θ 91*), or the simpler, "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ εὐλογηθῆναι τὰ μνῆστρα ταῦτα" (That this betrothal be blessed) (*Athens 1090*), or "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ εὐλογηθῆναι τὴν μνηστείαν ταύτην" (That this betrothal be blessed) (*Athens 64*), or "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ εὐλογηθῆναι τὰ μνῆστρα εἰς ἕνωσιν συζυγίας" (That these betrothals be blessed in a union of wedlock) (*Athens 573*), or with other content, "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ εὐλογηθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ" (That they be blessed in every spiritual blessing) and "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ εὐλογηθῆναι αὐτοὺς [αὐτῶν ἢ αὐτοῖς] εἰσόδους καὶ ἐξόδους" (That these [their (αὐτῶν or αὐτοῖς)] entrances and departures be blessed).[899]

In contrast, the double petition is encountered in all the printed editions, at least in as many as I could see. Obviously, it is due to a copying or printing error of the first, or one of the first, printed editions of the Euchologia that later ones relied upon. Perhaps the error also existed in a manuscript that this printed edition was based on, but maybe it was also due even to the publishers. Moreover, it is well known that the printed editions of the Euchologia copy each other without critical editing, which explains, among other things, also the similarity of the individual services that they contain, a thing which is not observed in manuscripts. It is most likely that in place of the present entreaty, "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ εὐλογηθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ καὶ βεβαίᾳ πίστει" (That they be blessed in concord and firm faith), there would exist one from the litanies above that begin in a similar manner.

899. In other liturgical uses, the "entrances and departures" (εἰσόδους καὶ ἐξόδους) refer to entrances into life through birth and departures by death, such as in the third prayer from the Vespers for Pentecost, "Σοὶ χάριν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ὁμολογοῦμεν, ἐπὶ ταῖς εἰσόδοις ἡμῶν ταῖς εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον, καὶ ταῖς ἐξόδοις, αἳ τὰς ἐλπίδας ἡμῶν τῆς ἀναστάσεως καὶ τῆς ἀκηράτου ζωῆς, διὰ τῆς σῆς ἀψευδοῦς ἐπαγγελίας προμνηστεύονται" (We confess your grace for all things, for our entrances into this world, and departures, which obtain our hope of resurrection and unfading life through your certain promise). With regard to the "entrances and departures" (εἰσόδους καὶ ἐξόδους) of the petition above, these terms most likely refer to the entrance of the betrothed into their new life as spouses and their future departure from the marital union through death.

The error did not remain unnoticed. We know of two attempts for its correction: First, in the printed edition of the Hagiasmatarion, which was done in Venice in 1869, the two similar entreaties were merged into one, "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ εὐλογηθῆναι αὐτοὺς καὶ φυλαχθῆναι ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ καὶ βεβαίᾳ πίστει" (That they be blessed and preserved in concord and firm faith). Second, in the printed edition of the Great Euchologion of M. Saliveros in Athens 1927 (edited by the priest, N. Papadopoulos), the first entreaty becomes, "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ διαφυλαχθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ καὶ βεβαίᾳ πίστει." (That they be kept safe in concord and firm faith) and the two final entreaties are condensed into one, "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ εὐλογηθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἐν ἀμέμπτῳ βιοτῇ καὶ πολιτείᾳ." (That they be blessed in a blameless way of life and conduct). In a footnote, the petition of the *Codex Megistēs Lavras Θ 91* is quoted, "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ εὐλογηθῆναι αὐτοῖς εἰσόδους καὶ ἐξόδους" (That their entrances and departures be blessed).[900]

However, other similar errors also exist in our liturgical books that are perpetuated up until nowadays from a poorly understood adherence to the tradition created from the first printed editions.

258

In order for the priest to celebrate the Presanctified, must he read the canon for holy communion beforehand, as during the other Liturgies?

The canon for receiving holy communion, as well as the whole preparation service before holy communion and the thanksgiving one after it, are not connected with the Divine Liturgy of the sacred Chrysostomos or of Basileios the Great, but with holy communion. Consequently, whether the believer communes during one of the above Liturgies or during the Presanctified, or outside of it as one who is ill at home, he/she ought, if able, to also prepare himself/herself for holy communion with the reading of this special service.

In the Liturgy of the Presanctified, preparatory and thanksgiving prayers before and after holy communion exist incorporated,

900. Ν. Π. Παπαδόπουλος, ed., *Εὐχολόγιον τὸ Μέγα* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1927), 177.

and the standard rubrics provide for the so-called customary newer prayers and troparia to be said before and after holy communion. From the fraction of the Holy Bread onward, everything is said "as also in the Liturgy of Chrysostomos." We write these things for it to be shown from liturgical practice that preparation for holy communion during the Presanctified is unrelated to the preparation that was done during the Divine Liturgy where the precious gifts were consecrated. And this is written to keep someone from making the excuse that once they were said there, their repetition is needless during the Presanctified.

However, we also have a witness from the *Codex National Library of Athens 758* of the seventeenth century, which describes in detail the order for this Liturgy. There, it expressly attests that the priest said "the prayers for holy communion with compunction" before the celebration of the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified. The service for holy communion is indeed incorporated, according to the order of this codex, in the whole daily office since its reading is provided for after the dismissal of the Ninth Hour and before even the priest takes "kairos" for the celebration of the Presanctified.

259

Does the priest take "kairos" for the celebration of the Presanctified, and if yes, when and in what manner?

We wrote extensively in the answer to question 81 regarding if, when, and how the priest takes "kairos" during the Liturgy of the Presanctified. The current Hieratika simply state the priest "taking kairos,"[901] and for this reason, reasonable questions are generated for celebrants. In that answer, we saw what the tradition of the standard rubrics of the manuscripts attest. In accordance with these and the practice also observed on the Holy Mountain and by many priests, which is also theoretically justified, during the reading of the psalms for the Ninth Hour, the priest goes out to the middle of the temple, makes a prostration to the presider[902] or to the throne of the hier-

901. "λαβὼν καιρόν."

902. See question 302, for a discussion of the "presider" (προεστώς).

arch, venerates the icons and then makes an inclination[903] to the people, enters the holy bēma, and vests. He does not say any of the usual things in the service of the "kairos," except only "Through the prayers . . ."[904] or "O God, have mercy on me the sinner."[905] This manner that the priest takes "kairos" is on the one hand ancient, just as also many other elements of the Liturgy of the Presanctified, but on the other hand consistent with the liturgical character of the Presanctified. The omission of the trisagion, as well as the troparia that are said after the trisagion and during the kissing of the icons, which are all much later, since they are not encountered even in the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Patriarch Philotheos of Constantinople (fourteenth century), is owed to the ancient form. The priest does not say the prayer, "O Lord, stretch forth . . .,"[906] because he is not about to celebrate "the bloodless sacred-service,"[907] but only a service of communion from the Presanctified Gifts.

260

Why is the exclamation of the prayer of the trisagion said first and afterward the prayer and the same exclamation again repeated inaudibly?

Indeed, the manner according to which nowadays the reading of the prayer of the trisagion hymn is combined with its exclamation, but also with the chanting of the hymn itself, can be characterized at a minimum as strange. Just as we saw in the case of the antiphons and their prayers (answer to question 234), the normal place for the prayer would be after a diaconal synaptē and before its exclamation. After this, the chanting of the trisagion ought to follow, which essentially is also itself an antiphon, since originally it was chanted as an ephymnion of the psalm that was the eisodikon of the Divine Liturgy (see the answer to question 237). In addition to the above, this content of the prayer of the trisagion, which is nothing other than a

903. "σχῆμα."
904. "Δι' εὐχῶν . . ."
905. "Ὁ Θεός, ἱλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ."
906. "Κύριε ἐξαπόστειλον . . ."
907. "τὴν ἀναίμακτον λειτουργίαν."

prayer to God for Him to accept the trisagion hymn that the mouth of His people is about to chant, also requires this sequence. Such a petition is logical to be preceding the chanting; otherwise, it comes, in some manner, "after the fact."[908] The fact that this is the place of the prayer and of the hymn is attested to by the ancient manuscripts that place the prayer before the exclamation and naturally also before the trisagion hymn. Nikolaos Kabasilas also attests to the same thing that was done during his period (fourteenth century): "Before this hymn, the priest supplicates God to accept the hymn and to give in return grace to the singers . . . and he sets forth the cause, 'For holy are you . . .' And when proclaiming this and adding a doxology, this is done as a signal to the holy people for the singing of the trisagion, and after saying 'Amen' to the doxology, according to custom, they begin the hymn" (*Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 21, 1).[909]

This correct sequence began to be disturbed when, together with the other prayers of the Divine Liturgy, it also became prevalent for the prayer of the trisagion hymn to be said inaudibly. The first way for covering its reading was offered by the great synaptē, the litany of peace, which originally preceded the trisagion hymn. The deacon said the litany of peace, and, at the same time, the priest said the prayer, and after the litany of peace came the prayer's exclamation, which had been read in the meantime. The great synaptē before the trisagion hymn was preserved in the service of the great monastic schēma, when this is celebrated according to the ancient correct form, connected with the Divine Liturgy. However, gradually, the beginning of the Divine Liturgy was transferred before the three antiphons and the great synaptē followed this transfer and was placed in its present position connected with the first antiphon, the prayer, and its exclamation. While the prayer of the trisagion remained in its place, it was said during the chanting of the apolytikia and the kontakion, after the entrance. The exclamation was preserved in its

908. "κατόπιν ἑορτῆς." With this colloquial Greek expression (which literally means "after the feast"), Phountoulēs may be making a play on words, juxtaposing the "late" arrival of the petition after the festive words of the troparia have been said.

909. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 21.1 (SC 4bis:148–151).

old place, and "Let us pray to the Lord," which is also said nowadays before the exclamation, is a remnant of the diaconal synaptē. This practice was preserved up until nowadays in Slavic and Romanian liturgical practice and on the Holy Mountain.

Among us,[910] another taxis became prevalent, less faithful to the correct ancient tradition. Since the number of troparia was reduced and the priests were used to chanting the kontakion according to the model for concelebration, the exclamation was preserved in its ancient place, but the prayer was read after it, during the time the hymn was chanted, again with its exclamation. As we saw, the same thing became prevalent to be done partly also with the prayers of the antiphons, but also with the prayers of Matins and Vespers, with the difference that in the prayers of the antiphons the exclamation was not repeated. The prayers of Matins and Vespers were said together with the exclamations much before their original place. The exclamation was repeated in its original place. A remnant of the chanting of the trisagion hymn after the prayer is its triple recitation by the priests after the completion of the prayer.

It should be noted that these two solutions that are implemented nowadays were not the only ones that were applied according to time and place after the transfer of the litany of peace. Thus, we also have a third form that is encountered in the manuscripts with different variations. The prayer and the exclamation were said inaudibly during the apolytikia; the deacon asked permission for the beginning of the trisagion ("Bless, Master, the time of the trisagion"),[911] the priest gave it ("Blessed is God who in a thrice-holy voice . . ."),[912] and the deacon, after the completion of the kontakion, omitting the synaptē, gave the signal for the beginning of the hymn, "saying loudly,"[913] to those "outside"[914] or to "those outside,"[915] "display-

910. Namely, in the Church of Greece.
911. "Εὐλόγησον, δέσποτα, τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ τρισαγίου."
912. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός, ὁ ἐν τρισαγίῳ φωνῇ . . ."
913. "λέγων μεγάλως."
914. "ἐκτός."
915. "τοὺς ἔξω."

ing"[916] his orarion: "And to the ages of ages."[917] This dialogue of deacon and priest and the intervention of the former for a beginning of the chanting of the trisagion was certainly indispensable during the transitional era where two great synaptes were also in existence concurrently (after "Blessed is the kingdom . . ." and before the trisagion) and the omission of the second one was dependent on the discretion of the celebrant. The chanters waited for the sign from the deacon whether they ought to wait for the recitation of the synaptē or immediately begin the trisagion. Namely, "And to the ages of ages," which in a unique case in our worship is said by the deacon at the end of the priestly exclamation, has its origin, precisely, from this intervention of the deacon. In other words, it was something almost analogous to the emphasized and melodious recitation of the final phrases read nowadays of hymns or of readings that is done in order for a sign to be given to the priest or deacon that the reading was completed, and he must say what belongs to him.[918]

Another way related to the aforementioned was the omission of the synaptē and exclamation, the intervention of the deacon for a beginning of the chanting of the trisagion, and the recitation of the prayer and exclamation inaudibly during it. The taxis prevailing among us combines elements from all of the above ways.

In any case, given that it became prevalent for the prayer to be said inaudibly, the recitation of the prayer during the apolytikia is more consistent with the original rubric for this point of the Divine Liturgy and with the logical sequence of things. At that time and before the chanting of the trisagion, the petition for its acceptance by God will come and the exclamation will be said only one time in its correct place.

916. "δεικνύων."

917. "Καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων."

918. Chanters often also use this melodious emphasis to remind clergy of the tone.

261

During Great Friday, in many places the custom exists for the faithful to remain fasting in order to receive antidōron at the end of the service, which is kept from the Divine Liturgy on Great Thursday. Is this permitted, inasmuch as a Divine Liturgy is not celebrated during this day?[919]

262

During Great Friday, why is the Divine Liturgy not celebrated, or at least the Presanctified?

During Great Friday, a complete Divine Liturgy is never celebrated for two reasons: First, the Divine Liturgy, as is well known, is a Paschal and joyous mystery and therefore its celebration is incompatible with days of mourning and fasting, as Great Friday is particularly. Second, the commemoration of the passion of the Lord and his sacrifice[920] on the cross, which is the theme of this day, was considered as so complete that it was not judged appropriate or logical for it to be duplicated by the celebration of the Divine Liturgy which itself also has the same theme. Symeōn of Thessaloniki summarizes in a succinct fashion the patristic tradition in question, "We do not perform a complete Liturgy on holy and Great Friday because the Lord handed down the mysteries in remembrance of His passion on Thursday, on Friday He voluntarily submitted to the passion; and by the cross He willingly sacrificed Himself to the Father, as He says, giving Himself up and not delivered up to those who wished to murder. Wherefore also, since the sacrifice has come to pass at that time in His Divine Body by the passion, it is not necessary for us to do the things in remembrance of His passion again, when He has suffered this.[921] On account of this,

919. This refers to the practice by some faithful in Greece of consuming antidōron on Great Friday morning, even though a Liturgy is not presently celebrated.

920. "Ιερουργία," is translated here as "sacrifice," since the word appears related to the use of "Ιερουγέω" in the text cited from Symeōn of Thessaloniki that follows.

921. In other words, it is not necessary to duplicate the events of the passion on Great Friday in a complete Liturgy, on the very day when the passion is

we did not at all receive performing a complete sacrifice at that time" (*Answer to Gabriël of Pentapolis*, 56).[922]

However, according to an equally ancient tradition, a Presanctified was celebrated on Great Friday, connected, as always, with the Vespers of this day. In our present liturgical books, traces of this practice are not preserved because the celebration of the Presanctified ceased in the Byzantine Church relatively quite early, namely, during the twelfth–thirteenth century. In the Western Church, it has been preserved up until nowadays. In manuscript Typika, Euchologia, and Evangelistaria, which extend up until the twelfth century, the celebration of the Presanctified is clearly provided for during Great Friday. For example, the Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople from the ninth century notes that after the gospel reading of Vespers, "the deacon says the great ektenēs and the other elements of the Presanctified. The chanters, 'Now the powers.'[923] Koinōnikon, 'Taste and see'[924]" (*T. Staurou 40* and *Patmos 266*).[925] The Typikon of the Monastery of the Evergetis also prescribes the same thing: "And the rest of the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified, except neither do we say, 'O Gladsome Light,'[926] nor 'Let my prayer be set forth.'[927] For these come to an end on Great Wednesday" (*Codex Athens 788* from the twelfth century).[928] Among other codices, *Sinai 150, Athens 662, 713,* and *Vatopediou 869*, all from the twelfth century or earlier, these presuppose a Liturgy of the Presanctified during Great Friday. Symeōn of Thessaloniki also knew this: "A Presanctified was thus celebrated from the beginning during holy and Great Friday; it never seemed to be tolerable to the Fathers for any day to pass and not to see the Lord through the mysteries, through which He says that He

---

already made present liturgically in the Great Week services.

922. PG 155:908b–908c.

923. "Νῦν αἱ δυνάμεις . . ."

924. "Γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε . . ."

925. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:80–83.

926. "Φῶς ἱλαρόν"

927. "Κατευθυνθήτω."

928. Robert H. Jordan, ed. and trans., *The Synaxarion of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, March to August, The Movable Cycle*, Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations, 6.6 (Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2005), 494–495.

is also one with us and, 'Behold, I am with you all days . . ..'[929] On holy and Great Friday, we do not perform a complete Liturgy . . .[930] but we received to serve and to present the Presanctified Gifts as in many parts of the above Diataxeis.[931] And you will find this written in the ancient gospel and epistle books. Nevertheless, this is not performed now"[932] (*Answer to Gabriēl of Pentapolis*, 56).

Already around 1200, Antonii of Novgorod, who visited Constantinople at that time, attests that the Liturgy of the Presanctified was not celebrated during Great Friday.[933] We do not know the reasons that caused the abandonment of the ancient custom for the celebration of the Presanctified on Great Friday. Symeōn attributes it to the prevalence of the Jerusalemite monastic Typikon, which indeed took place during this era and brought about significant changes to the divine worship of the Church of Constantinople. It appears that Symeōn's observation is correct. From as much evidence that we have from the *Pilgrimage* of Aetheria (fourth century)[934] up until the Typikon for the temple of the Resurrection of Jerusalem from the

929. Matt 28:20; PG 155:905c–905d.

930. PG 155:908b.

931. In the answer to Gabriēl, Symeōn mentions various Typika, including that of the Great Church and of Saint Sabas.

932. PG 155:908c. Compare also the translation in *Συμεών, Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Θεσσαλονίκης, Τὰ ἅπαντα, ἐκ τῆς ἀρχαίας εἰς τὴν ὁμιλουμένην μετενεχθέντα πρὸς ψυχωφελῆ χρῆσιν τῶν εὐλαβῶν ὀρθοδόξων ἱερέων καὶ λαϊκῶν: ἐγκρίσει τῆς ἱερᾶς συνόδου τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος μετὰ πολλῶν διορθώσεων κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον κείμενον* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, n.d.), 374.

933. Antonii, Archbishop of Novgorad (r. 1210–1222, 1223, 1225–1228, d. 1232), was the author of the Книга Паломник (*The Pilgrim Book*), which provides a detailed account of Constantinople's sacred sites. For additional information, see Simon Franklin and Anthony Cutler, "Antony," *ODB* 1:124, and George Majeska, "Russian Pilgrims in Constantinople," *DOP* 56 (2002): 93–108.

934. *Itinerarium Egeriae.* This fourth century writing is a travelogue of a woman's pilgrimage to Palestine, Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Asia Minor. The writing is divided into two parts: a diary of the pilgrimage and a description of services in Jerusalem. Phountoulēs's attribution and titling of this work (Ὁδοιπορικὸν τῆς Αἰθερίας, *Peregrinatio* of Aetheria) reflect the scholarly discussion at the time of his writing. Current scholarship predominantly attributes authorship to a writer known as Egeria and titles the work, *Itinerarium Egeriae.*

year 1122 (*Codex T. Staurou 43*), it does not appear a Liturgy of the Presanctified was celebrated in Jerusalem on Great Friday.

And now specifically concerning the first question. Perhaps the distribution of antidōron, which was preserved for us in some places during Great Friday, is a remembrance or even, in some way, a survival of the ancient custom of celebrating the Liturgy of the Presanctified after the Vespers of Great Friday? It is very possible. According to the evidence of the ancient Typika and the testimony of Symeōn of Thessaloniki, antidōron was also distributed outside of the Liturgy during the reading or chanting of Psalm 33, which concludes the service of the Typika, "for our sanctification" (*Dialogue*, chapter 330).[935] If we pay attention to the Triōdia in use today, we will discover that after the service of the Ninth Hour of the Great Hours of Great Friday, there exists the service of the Typika that nowadays has fallen into disuse. And one more indication from the Typikon of the Church of the Resurrection, which we referenced above: On Great Thursday, the patriarch kneaded leaven on the holy sepulcher, the "holy leaven," which he sprinkled with rosewater and wine and then placed on the stone of the tomb in remembrance of the seals.[936] He distributed this leaven to the people ("he distributed")[937] near the end of the service of Vespers of Great Friday. Namely, after the doxastikon of the aposticha, "When Joseph with Nikodēmos took you down from the tree, who are clothed with light as with a garment . . .,"[938] "immediately the patriarch shall enter the holy tomb and distribute the holy leaven; and immediately, 'Now let your servant depart . . . .'"[939]

---

935. PG 155:596d.

936. This refers to the seals mentioned in Matt 27:22. The manuscript text of *T. Staurou 43* being referenced is published in A. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, 5 vols. (St. Petersburg: B. Κιρσπάουμ, 1891–1898), 2:147.

937. "ἐρρόγευε" (Lampe, s.v. "ῥογεύω").

938. "Σὲ τὸν ἀναβαλλόμενον, τὸ φῶς ὥσπερ ἱμάτιον, καθελὼν Ἰωσὴφ ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, σὺν Νικοδήμῳ . . ."

939. "Νῦν ἀπολύεις . . ." A. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας*, 5 vols. (St. Petersburg: B. Κιρσπάουμ, 1891–1898) 2:161.

And again, in connection with this retrospection into the ancient practice, let us repeat how precious and worthy of respect are the age-old liturgical traditions that are preserved in some places. They oftentimes appear to us insignificant and negligible. However, in many cases they go back to an early antiquity and preserve most important liturgical elements, which later tradition for various reasons rejected.

263

During Renewal Week, the older Euchologia say that in the funeral service the canon of Pascha is chanted in its entirety. The modern ones have only the katabasies. Which must we follow?

264

During Renewal Week, which epistle and gospel readings must be said in the funeral service?

The topic of the funeral service for Renewal Week has not been specifically studied and, because of this fact, it is also difficult for anyone to speak with absolute certainty regarding what is or is not precise and correct to be done during the above questionable points of this service. Below we will attempt to give, as much as possible, an accurate picture of these liturgical problems, but without further research of the issue, based on the tradition of the Church and of other witnesses that may have eluded us, precluding more correct answers.

Therefore, from as many elements as we could gather, it appears that in the manuscript tradition we do not have sufficient evidence that gives us a clear outline of what is to be performed. The only somewhat old element is the note from the Typika and the Pentēkostaria, that during Renewal Week they did not chant the customary service for those who have "fallen asleep," "but the entire resurrection one; that is to say, 'Christ is risen'[940] three times, 'Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . .,'[941] the canon of Pascha, and the epistle and the gospel readings. The kiss is done at lauds and the dismissal."

940. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη . . ."
941. "Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι . . ."

This, or nearly this, must be the maternal form (for us to characterize it so) of the funeral service for Renewal Week. The Church's intention is clear and easily comprehensible within the framework of the ideas and tendencies that govern the differentiation of the services during the week of Pascha. During it, every penitential and mournful element is removed and the resurrectional atmosphere of the Sunday of Pascha absolutely dominates. The whole week "is reckoned" as one Paschal day, as one unified feast of the Lord. If we take under our consideration that the funeral service is a service of Matins, then we understand why during Renewal Week, apart from the resurrectional Paschal service, there is not chanted, there does not "fit," another service of Matins, and especially a penitential one, such as the funeral service. The same things also apply to the day of the leavetaking of Pascha, the Wednesday before Ascension.

In the rubric above, it is expressly stated that "the canon of Pascha" is chanted, naturally an entire one, and that "the epistle and gospel readings" are read. The ones of Pascha? The ones of the day? The funereal ones? The rubric does not prescribe it. If we judge from the entire framework of the service, the funereal readings probably must be excluded.

We encounter a more extensive rubric in the Small Euchologia, under the title, "Explanation regarding the funeral service for laity, if this happens to be in Renewal Week, translated from the Illyrian Euchologion."[942] "Illyrian Euchologion" probably characterizes the Slavonic Euchologion (see Great Hagiasmatarion, in Venice 1869, pp. 223–224, and 1899, pp. 211–212). According to it, the entire canon of Pascha is again chanted during the transfer of the remains to the temple and in continuation within the temple, with a funereal synaptē, a prayer, and an exclamation after the third and sixth odes, and after these, the hypakoē of Pascha after the third ode and the funereal kontakion and its oikos ("With the saints . . .,"[943] "You only are immortal . . ."[944]) after the sixth, "As many of you that have

942. "Ἑρμηνεία περὶ τῆς νεκρωσίμου ἀκολουθίας τῶν κοσμικῶν εἰ τύχει τῇ ἑβδομάδι τῆς διακαινησίμου ἐκ τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ Εὐχολογίου μεταφρασθεῖσα."

943. "Μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων . . ."

944. "Αὐτὸς μόνος ὑπάρχεις ἀθάνατος . . ."

been baptized into Christ . . ."[945] instead of the trisagion, "the epistle reading from Acts of the corresponding day, Alleluia in the second tone, the eōthinon gospel, then 'Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . ..'"[946] And again, it is not prescribed which of the eleven eōthina gospels must be read. In the Hagiasmatarion of the edition of Rome (volume 2, 1955, pp. 38–66), there is a complete funeral service for Renewal Week with an entire canon of Pascha that is chanted in the temple (while walking "Christ is risen . . .," long),[947] the epistle reading of the day, and the first eōthinon gospel reading.[948] The readings are also again found after the sixth ode of the canon. In addition, the entire canon of Pascha is also provided to be chanted by the *Handbook for the funeral service*, assembled by I. Asklanidēs, in Hermoupolis, Syros, 1875, pp. 37ff.,[949] and by the Typikon of Kōnstantinos the prōtopsaltēs, Constantinople 1874, p. 274.[950] In the latter two, it is not prescribed which epistle or gospel reading would be read, but it is noteworthy that their reading is not done, as according to the ancient Typika, between the sixth and seventh odes, but after the exaposteilarion. In this place, we find the readings in all the modern editions.

The abridgment of the canon and its limitation only to the katabasies and to "Christ is risen . . ." three times with "Jesus having risen from the grave . . ."[951] is encountered for the first time, as far as I can tell, in the Typikon of G. Violakēs (see the edition of M. Saliveros, Athens 1921, p. 439), obviously at the initiative of "the two suc-

945. "Ὅσοι εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε . . ."

946. "Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι . . ."

947 Chanting books provide melodies that are "short, longer, and long" (σύντομα, ἀργοσύντομα, καὶ ἀργά) for various troparia.

948. *Ἁγιασματάριον, Τὰ Μυστήρια* (Ῥώμη: Ἱερὰ Μονὴ τῆς Κρυπτοφέρρης, 1955), 2:38–66.

949. Ἰ. Ἀσκλανίδης, *Ἐγχειρίδιον νεκρωσίμου ἀκολουθίας* (Ἑρμούπολις, Σύρος: n.p., 1875), 37ff. The bibliographic information and page references could not be confirmed for this source. The author's name appears misspelled and most likely should be Ἀσλανίδης (Aslanidēs).

950. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed., 7th printing (Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 274.

951. "Ἀναστὰς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τοῦ τάφου . . ."

cessive committees," "which were appointed ad hoc by patriarchal decree."[952] This taxis is also followed by the modern printed editions of the Small Euchologia of the Apostolikē Diakonia of the Church of Greece (see the edition of 1972, pp. 221–227). The abridgment of troparia obviously took place for reasons of brevity. The precedent existed from the common funeral service for laity, where the funereal canon in plagal of second tone, "In celestial bridal chambers, the noble choir of the martyrs ceaselessly . . .,"[953] was also omitted earlier obviously for reasons of shortening the long service. The katabasies alone were preserved in the funeral service for Renewal Week. Moreover, the service was in any case shorter.

In the Great Euchologia, manuscript and printed editions, a funeral service for Renewal Week does not appear to exist anywhere. This would not appear strange to us, if we consider that the Euchologia contain the liturgical material useful in practice. In our case, given that the service was the Matins of Pascha, it was found handily in the Pentēkostarion. For the first time, as far as I know, it was included in the edition of the Great Euchologion edited by the protopresbyter, N. Papadopoulos (edition of M. Saliveros, Athens 1927, pp. 362–367).[954] The abbreviated form is also adopted here, only with the katabasies, although on page 364a, footnote 2, it is noted that "some services have more troparia of the canon."[955] The peculiarity of this edition is that it includes the epistle and gospel readings for the Sunday of Pascha ("the epistle and gospel readings of the day" from the rubrics was thus obviously understood) of course with a funereal allēlouarion. It is also again indicated in a footnote that "nowadays the epistle and gospel readings of the usual funeral service are customarily said" (p. 365a, footnote 1) and concerning the epistle reading, that "the Great Euchologion of Orthodox Russia assigns the epistle reading for the current day to be said" (p. 366a,

952. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 439.

953. "Ἐν οὐρανίοις θαλάμοις διηνεκῶς . . ."

954. Ν. Π. Παπαδόπουλος, ed., *Εὐχολόγιον τὸ Μέγα* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1927), 362–367.

955. Page 364a refers to the first column on this page, which contains separately numbered footnotes from those of the second column.

footnote 1). The Small Euchologion of the Apostolikē Diakonia assigns "the epistle and gospel reading of the day."[956]

And now in summary:

a) The older taxis provides for the chanting of the entire canon of Pascha. The modern one, only of the katabasies. Reasons of shortening the service dictated the abridgment, just as also the omission of the canon during the common funeral service. The ancient taxis, naturally, is the most accurate. The abridgment was done "by oikonomia."

b) With regard to the readings, the most ancient rubrics are unclear. However, it is obvious that the interpretation is more correct that they mean the readings of the day on which the service is celebrated, with their prokeimena and allēlouaria. Concerning the epistle reading, all the sources agree. Concerning the gospel readings, the variant of reading the first eōthinon exists. Consequently, the readings of Pascha are only said in the case of celebrating the service on the same day as the Sunday of Pascha. In contrast to the special readings for the funeral service, these readings are certainly unrelated to the dead, but are in accordance with the spirit and the letter of the funeral service for Renewal Week, just as the ecclesiastical tradition desired and formed it.

265

During the transfer of the remains from the temple to the grave, what must be chanted, the trisagion or "I grieve and I lament . . ."[957]?

According to all the manuscripts (see *Dionysiou 450, Sinai 981, 985, 989*, and others) and the printed Euchologia, during the transfer of the dead from the temple to the grave, the chanting of "Holy God . . ." is provided for, "slowly" or "quietly." In some manuscripts, it is prescribed that the trisagion is chanted three times or that it is followed by the customary "All Holy Trinity . . .,"[958] and so forth.

956. *Μικρὸν Εὐχολόγιον* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἀποστολικὴ Διακονία, 1956), 226.
957. "Θρηνῶ καὶ ὀδύρομαι . . ."
958. "Παναγία Τριάς . . ."

In the *Codex Sinai 988*, added to the triple chanting "quietly" of the trisagion is the troparion, "'Give rest, O our Savior.'[959] Glory, the same. Both now, 'O Christ God, who from a Virgin rose upon the world.'[960]" Symeōn of Thessaloniki attests that the trisagion was chanted "for the glorification of the Trinity, our only God" (*Dialogue,* chapter 368),[961] which he also above theologizes that it is chanted "because also the departed servants of the Trinity proclaimed the Trinity, have been perfected in the Trinity, walk in the Trinity, and will be assigned with the angels to those unceasingly singing the trisagion hymn" (*Dialogue*, chapter 363).[962] Even the procession of the epitaphios, which takes place in imitation of the carrying out of those who have "fallen asleep," at the end of Matins of Great Saturday, in order to place ("bury") it on the holy table, is done while chanting the trisagion.

As far as I know, the chanting of the idiomelon of the plagal of fourth tone, "I grieve and I lament . . .," was first introduced into the Typika of the Great Church of Kōnstantinos the prōtopsaltēs (see the edition in Constantinople, 1874, p. 276)[963] and of G. Violakēs (edition of M. Saliveros, Athens 1921, p. 439),[964] obviously for reasons of variety, in order that the same hymn, the trisagion, not be repeated before and after the funeral service. Perhaps it also existed somewhere from a local tradition, and maybe in imitation of the funeral of monks, during which at the corresponding point the funereal idiomela of the eight tones of the Damascene[965] are chanted, but which, it must be noted, are not also chanted elsewhere in this service. "I grieve and I lament . . ." was perhaps chosen for its phrase, "and I saw lying in the tombs . . .,"[966] which made it more

959. "Ἀνάπαυσον, Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν . . ."
960. "Ὁ ἐκ Παρθένου ἀνατείλας . . ."
961. PG 155:685d.
962. PG 155:677a.
963. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (2nd ed., 7th printing; Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 276.
964. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 439.
965. Saint Iōannēs of Damascus (ca. 650 or ca. 675–749 or 753/4).
966. "καὶ ἴδω ἐν τοῖς τάφοις κειμένην . . ."

suited for the occasion than the others. From the Typika, it was included in the modern Euchologia. The oldest practice naturally is the only historically justified one.

266

From the Sunday of Thomas up until the leavetaking of Pascha, which doxastikon is chanted during the kiss and the transfer of the remains to the grave, "It is the day of Resurrection . . ."[967] or "Brethren, come, let us give a last kiss . . ."[968] and "I grieve and I lament . . ."[969] respectively? Is not the first one only proper during Renewal Week?

According to the Typikon, after Renewal Week, during the entire period of Pascha, the ordinary funeral service is chanted "as previously formulated," namely, with "Brethren, come, let us give a last kiss . . ." during the kiss and "I grieve and I lament . . ." from the temple to the grave. The only difference with the funeral service outside of the Paschal period is that while walking from the house to the temple, instead of the trisagion, "Christ is risen . . ."[970] is chanted, and after "Blessed is our God . . .,"[971] "Christ is risen . . ." is chanted three times as customary (Typikon, G. Violakēs, edition of M. Saliveros, Athens, 1921, p. 439).[972] The Typikon of Kōnstantinos (Constantinople, 1874, p. 274) also provides for precisely the same thing.[973] The Great Euchologion published under the editorship of protopresbyter N. Papadopoulos (edition of M. Saliveros, Athens, p. 467a, footnote 1) agrees with the standard rubric above.[974] The Hagiasmatarion edition of Rome (vol. 2, 1955, p. 55) has the same rubric

967. "Ἀναστάσεως ἡμέρα . . ."
968. "Δεῦτε τελευταῖον ἀσπασμόν . . ."
969. "Θρηνῶ καὶ ὀδύρομαι . . ."
970. "Χριστὸς ἀνέστη . . ."
971. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν . . ."
972. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 439.
973. Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Βυζάντιος, Πρωτοψάλτης, *Τυπικὸν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κατὰ τὴν τάξιν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (2nd ed., 7th printing; Ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει: Γεώργιος Σεϊτανίδης, 1874), 274.
974. Ν. Π. Παπαδόπουλος, ed., *Εὐχολόγιον τὸ Μέγα* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1927), 467a, n. 1. 467a refers to the first column on this page,

as well, with the difference that while walking to the grave "Christ is risen . . ." is chanted slowly, in replacement of the trisagion, just as we saw in the answer to the preceding question.[975]

I do not know of older rubrics other than the witnesses above, and from what by analogy we can conclude from the remaining services that are celebrated during the period of Pascha from the Sunday of Thomas onward, only the trisagion is replaced with "Christ is risen . . ." and the same hymn is inserted three times after "Blessed is our God . . .." Beyond this, the services are not subject to change. The rubric of the modern Euchologia concerning the replacement of "Brethren, come, let us give a last kiss . . ." and "I grieve and I lament . . ." with "It is the day of the Resurrection . . ." is not justified by the facts.

267

After the great entrance during the Liturgy of the Presanctified, must the beautiful gate be closed and be opened at, "With fear of God, faith and love, draw near,"[976] or not?

The *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts,* which is borne under the name of Blessed Theodōros the Stoudite, expressly attests that "after the entrance of the divine gifts, the doors are immediately closed."[977] The manuscripts and the rubrics for the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified do not attest regarding this closing of the doors after the great entrance. However, this does not have significance because it is well known that not only in the Liturgy of the Presanctified but also in the complete Liturgy after the entrance of the gifts, the bēma doors and the curtain were closed. The old-time priests remember that the same practice applied even in parishes

---

which contains separately numbered footnotes from those of the second column.

975. *Ἁγιασματάριον, Τὰ Μυστήρια* (Ῥώμη: Ἱερὰ Μονὴ τῆς Κρυπτοφέρρης, 1955), 2:55.

976. "Μετὰ φόβου Θεοῦ, πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης προσέλθετε."

977. PG 99:1689a. Saint Theodōros the Stoudite (759–826) was a major monastic figure and opponent of iconoclasm, who is attributed many works, including extensive hymnography.

until recently. In the monasteries of the Holy Mountain up until nowadays the beautiful gate is closed after the great entrance and is opened at "With fear of God...," and the intermediate blessings are given by the priest either while parting the curtain a little or even behind the closed curtain.

During modern times, the tendency became prevalent in parish temples during the complete Liturgy for the bēma doors and the curtain not to be closed except at the koinōnikon in order in this manner for the participation of the people in the Divine Liturgy to be facilitated by the better following of what is being celebrated. However, in the Liturgy of the Presanctified, by reason of the conservatism generally of the services of Great Lent and the stronger influence on them of the monastic practice, notwithstanding that the modern practice began to be extended also to this Liturgy by many priests, namely, for the beautiful gate not to be closed except during the koinōnikon, nevertheless for the most part the older custom still continues to be in force and the bēma doors and the curtain are closed during this Liturgy immediately after the entrance of the Gifts in order to be opened only at "With fear of God . . . ."

In this struggle of the modern practice with the older one, it is not easy for anyone to foresee which will finally prevail. In any case, speaking in favor of closing the curtain during the Presanctified is the "veiled,"[978] "mournful,"[979] and "altogether more mysterious,"[980] character of this Liturgy, according to Theodōros the Stoudite,[981] which admittedly is emphasized more with the closing of the gates after the entrance of the precious gifts.

978. "συνεσκιασμένος."
979. "πενθηρός."
980. "μυστικώτερος εἰς πᾶν."
981. PG 99:1688b.

268

When the holy myron from the myron container is exhausted, is it permitted for us to add oil?

As the question is posed, there is no other answer than that it is not permitted. Holy myron is a consecrated sacramental element and under no circumstances can common oil substitute for it. The myron container does not sanctify the myron, but rather the myron sanctifies the myron container.

However, naturally, the questioner does not mean the full exhaustion of the holy myron, but the increasing of its diminished supply with the addition of oil, as by analogy is done with Hagiasmos, the oil of unction, and even with holy communion by the addition of wine, regarding which we discussed in the answer to question thirty-nine. Under this presupposition, the answer could be entirely different.

The old and modern practices recognize, certainly by oikonomia, the addition of oil to holy myron for its increase in order to meet the needs of the Church. An answer of Iōannēs the bishop of Kitros to Kōnstantinos Kabasilas the archbishop of Dyrrachion prescribes that "it is allowed . . . for oil to be blended with myron when found very low." In this way, the holy myron "when increased" "will be sufficient to confer sanctification for those needing it."[982] Meletios Pĕgas, the patriarch of Alexandria, speaks in his letter addressed to the Hieremias, the master[983] of Moldovlachia, regarding the augmentation of holy myron, which the metropolitan of the region

982. Γ.Α. Ῥάλλης and Μ. Ποτλῆς, *Σύνταγμα θείων καὶ ἱερῶν Κανόνων τῶν τε Ἁγίων καὶ Πανευφήμων Ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν Οἰκουμενικῶν καὶ τοπικῶν Συνόδων καὶ τῶν κατὰ μέρος Ἁγίων Πατέρων*, 6 vols. (Ἀθῆναι: Γ. Χαρτοφύλαξ, 1852–1859), 5:415. The canonical responses attributed to Iōannēs of Kitros are usually dated to the first half of the thirteenth century and little is known regarding the author. For a discussion and bibliography, see Spyros Troianos, "Byzantine Canon Law from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Centuries," in *The History of Byzantine and Eastern Canon Law to 1500*, ed. Wilfried Hartmann and Kenneth Pennington, vol. 4 of *History of Medieval Canon Law*, ed. Wilfried Hartmann and Kenneth Pennington (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2012), 202–203.

983. "αὐθέντης," effendi.

ought to do.[984] Moreover, in a report of the local synod in Bucharest of the year 1882, it is decided that the increasing of holy myron was done by the metropolitans, if necessary, with pure oil and it is added that this "is allowed by ecclesiastical custom." Blessed Nikodēmos of the Holy Mountain also attests that during his era, priests put "oil continuously into containers that had very little myron," resulting in making it "nearly all oil" and many Christians are not certain whether "they were anointed with myron" and seek to be anointed with myron even again, "which is most outrageous" (footnote 1 to canon 6 of the Council in Carthage).[985]

Certainly, from what we saw, it became obvious that the addition of oil to the holy myron in a case of necessity is not prohibited in principle. However, we must not forget that the holy myron is myron, namely, an aromatic substance that symbolizes the fragrance of Christ, which the one being sealed must exude. The continuous addition of oil makes the holy myron lose its fragrant scent, and its retention for a long time changes its composition and ruins its aroma. For this reason, it is opportune to repeat the words of Blessed Nikodēmos, which are addressed to the priests and the hierarchs also of our era "wherefore, we call on them . . . for the love of God to take

984. Meletios Pēgas (Μελέτιος Πηγάς), patriarch of Alexandria (1549–1601, r. 1590–1601), locum tenens of the Ecumenical Patriarchate (1597–1598), and an author of a large number of theological works, including unpublished letters. For the life of Meletios Pēgas, see Ἀγαθάγγελος Νινολάκης, *Μελέτιος ὁ Πηγᾶς ὁ Κρῆς, Πατριάρχης, Ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ ἐπιτηρητὴς τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Θρόνου 1545-1602* (Ἐν Χανίοις: Ἡ Πρόοδος, 1903) and Χριστόδουλος Κ. Παρασκευαΐδης, *Μελέτιος ὁ Πηγᾶς* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἔκδοσις τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 1971). Several of his letters were published in Émile Legrand, *Lettres de Mélétius Pigas antérieures à sa promotion au Patriarcat,* Bibliothèque Grecque Vulgaire IX (Paris: J. Maisonneuve, 1902). For the manuscript references of the letter cited, see Παῦλος Μενεβισόγλου, *Τὸ Ἅγιον Μύρον ἐν τῇ Ὀρθοδόξῳ Ἀνατολικῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἰδίᾳ κατὰ τὰς πηγὰς καὶ τὴν πράξιν τῶν νεωτέρων χρόνων τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριαρχείου,* Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων 14, 2nd ed. (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 1983), 81, n. 1. Phountoulēs relied upon this specific page from Menevisoglou's work for the examples cited in the present article.

985. Ἁγάπιος ἱερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 467. The footnote number was added to the text of Phountoulēs.

care to have abundant holy myron for their parishes and eparchies, because by leaving the Christians without myron or anointing them with oil and with unsuitable myron they sin mortally" (*Rudder*, third edition, in Zakynthos, 1864, p. 467).[986]

A special study by Father Pavlos Menevisoglou (now, Metropolitan of Sweden) deals with holy Myron, *The Holy Chrism in the Eastern Orthodox Church*, Analekta Vlatadōn 14, Thessaloniki, 1972.[987]

269

During a baptism, is the priest able to use Hagiasmos from a baptism that he celebrated on the previous Sunday?

Every service of holy baptism presupposes the sanctification of water, which in all our Euchologia, manuscripts, and printed editions, precedes the act itself of baptism. I know only one exception to this norm, which is observed in some places by us,[988] but certainly preserves an ancient tradition in the present case. Namely, on the day of the feast of Theophany, Great Hagiasmos is cast into the water of the baptismal font and the blessing of the water is omitted. I hold the opinion that this is done correctly.

In the Western Church, likewise according to ancient custom, the blessing of the water took place only one time a year, during the vigil of Pascha, and the water sanctified at that time was reserved throughout the whole year and baptisms were done with it. We do not have this custom in our Church. In Greek Orthodox temples abroad, where many baptisms take place every Sunday, I have known cases where they sanctify the water in many containers during the first baptism and afterwards, they replenish the water of the baptismal font and begin the subsequent baptisms from "Alle-

986. Ἀγάπιος ἱερομόναχος (Λεονάρδος) καὶ Ἅγιος Νικόδημος ὁ Ἁγιορείτης, *Πηδάλιον τῆς νοητῆς νηὸς τῆς μιᾶς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Ἐκκλησίας* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Βασ. Ρηγοπούλου, 1982), 467.

987. Παῦλος Μενεβισόγλου, *Τὸ Ἅγιον Μύρον ἐν τῇ Ὀρθοδόξῳ Ἀνατολικῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἰδίᾳ κατὰ τὰς πηγὰς καὶ τὴν πράξιν τῶν νεωτέρων χρόνων τοῦ Οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριαρχείου*, Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων 14, 2nd ed. (Θεσσαλονίκη: Πατριαρχικὸν Ἵδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, 1983). The English title in the text above is Metropolitan Pavlos Menevisoglou's own translation taken from the copyright page of the work.

988. The Church of Greece.

luia" with the pouring of the oil of exorcism, which also itself they sanctify during the first baptism. However, this constitutes a solution of necessity, which, naturally, no one would have the right to consider for its general application, much more when it does not concern the same day, but the following Sunday.

270

Can we change the place of the eōthinon gospel reading during Sundays and say it before the katabasies?

The original place of the eōthinon gospel reading for the monastic Sunday Matins is not absolutely verified. There are various relevant hypotheses that are supported by manuscript evidence or by the place of individual elements of the service for the Sunday Matins or by comparison with other liturgical forms. It appears more likely that the gospel reading for Matins was originally read in the place where the gospel reading for the festal Matins is also read nowadays, namely, after the stichologia of the Psalter and before the canons. In any case, in all the surviving manuscripts and even in the printed liturgical books, the eōthinon gospel is provided to be read before the canons. This taxis is precisely observed up until nowadays in the monasteries.

When the monastic Matins was introduced into the parish temples, a problem of adaptation for purely practical reasons arose. As is provided for by the arrangement set forth above, the taxis of the eōthinon gospel reading is inserted almost at the beginning of Matins. Certainly, in the parishes where the Psalter is not read, but only the troparia–kathismata were chanted (this established order was always in force and is expressly attested to by Symeōn of Thessaloniki), the reading of the eōthinon gospel took place even earlier than that in the monasteries. This did not have importance for the monasteries because the fathers arrive at the service before it even began. However, this does not take place in the parishes; the faithful arrive at the temple piecemeal and late; the gospel was read in an empty temple. However, the taxis of the eōthinon gospel reading is not an insignificant element of the resurrectional morning service, but this is its central and key point. The radiant proclamation of the

resurrection is heard during it and an actual re-enactment of this event takes place. For this reason, unknown in precisely what era, in any case during the years after the Fall,[989] the Fathers thought that a new place ought to be sought for the gospel reading to be transferred in order for the people to be present during its reading. It was transferred at that time after the canons, to a liturgically strange place, because it was not exactly located at the end, but in the middle of the ninth ode. In any case, this transfer at that time made matters easier because the canons were then chanted and thus enough time was saved in the interest of the faithful arriving.

In the meantime, matters changed considerably. The canons essentially fell into disuse (only the first and third odes were usually chanted, and these without stichologia), the katabasies were transferred from the end of each ode and chanted collectively after the synaxarion of the Mēnologion, and in addition the faithful are not arriving so early to the temple as during the era of the Tourkokratia.[990]

If with the current facts, those responsible for our liturgical affairs thought as the Fathers of that era, they ought to seek a new place for transferring the eōthinon gospel reading, naturally not transferring it before the katabasies nor to its ancient place, which centuries before was proven unsuitable for the parishes. Tradition would also again give us the best solution. In the ancient "asmatic" or parish Matins, the eōthinon gospel was read after the doxology and specifically after the resurrectional troparion, "Today salvation . . ."[991] or "Arising from the tomb . . .,"[992] which were alternately chanted every two Sundays. The parish Typikon had been composed on the basis of the needs and the reality of the faithful's life in the world and for this reason also on this point proved itself so down-to-earth. The key element of the resurrection Sunday Matins, the eōthinon gospel reading, ought to be read at a time when the entire congregation would be present. In this place we find it nowadays only during the

989. The Fall of Constantinople in 1453.

990. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

991. "Σήμερον σωτηρία . . ."

992. "Ἀναστὰς ἐκ τοῦ μνήματος . . ."

service of the Matins of Great Saturday (service of the lamentation upon the grave), in which the gospel is read after the end of the doxology before the dismissal.

It must be noted that the transfer is not as difficult as one would think at first glance. The transfer from the original place after the canons took place only in the parishes and certainly only in the Greek-speaking Orthodox Churches; and a new transfer will again concern, if it ever takes place, only them.

271

When is it preferable for the Artoklasia to be celebrated, during Vespers or Matins, and what is the purpose of its celebration?

272

If an Artoklasia takes place during the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, when is it read, before or after the rite of the Exaltation?

273

Can the faithful eat the loaves of the Artoklasia at any time of the day or must they be fasting? In the second case, what should we recommend to the faithful, when oftentimes the Artoklasia happens to be performed during Vespers?[993]

The Artoklasia, or "blessing of the loaves" (εὐλόγησις τῶν ἄρτων) as it is more customarily called in our liturgical texts, is a service celebrated in remembrance of the blessing and multiplication of the five loaves by the Lord in the desert, which is normally celebrated only during the service of Great Vespers, namely, during the vigil of great feasts.[994] Its taxis is very simple. Namely, during the apolytikion of the feast of the Lord or the long "O Virgin Theotokos . . .,"[995] which is chanted at the end of festal Great Vespers, the priest comes out

993. See also question 538 for a discussion of the Artoklasia.

994. Matthew 14:13–21; Mark 6:31–44; Luke 9:12–17; John 6:1–14.

995. "Θεοτόκε Παρθένε . . ." Chanting books provide melodies that are "short, longer, and long" (σύντομα, ἀργοσύντομα, καὶ ἀργά) for various troparia.

in the middle of the temple where the five loaves, grain, wine, and oil have been placed, censes them crosswise, recites the prayer, "O Lord Jesus Christ our God who blessed . . .,"[996] blesses the loaves, and leaves while the choir chants, "Blessed be the name of the Lord . . ."[997] and Psalm 33 up until verse 11, "The rich became poor and hungry" . . .,"[998] or only this verse three times. Precisely this taxis is attested to by Symeōn of Thessaloniki (*Dialogue*, chapter 342) and by the manuscripts, and it is observed even nowadays in the monasteries of Mount Athos. The purpose for the celebration of this service is two-fold. On the one hand, the sanctification of those who will partake of the loaves and the other blessed articles ("the loaves and the wine as sanctified by the blessing are distributed to those present, which also to those who partake with faith are impartings of charisms, healings, and many other gifts," *Dialogue*, chapter 342),[999] but on the other hand practical, namely, that the brethren who keep vigil are strengthened with a little food, who, after they spend part of the all-night vigil, will still remain in the temple also during the remainder of the night for the service of Matins. As Symeōn characteristically writes, "this [the Artoklasia] was prescribed specifically owing to the fatigue of the vigil, that the brothers after having obtained blessed bread of Christ and a small refreshment owing to the fatigue, thereafter, may have prayer for communion of the awesome mysteries, and especially the clergy" (*Dialogue*, chapter 342).[1000]

It is a consequence of all these things that according to the ancient correct practice, which is perpetuated on the Holy Mountain and is attested to by Symeōn, the blessing of the loaves is done only during all-night vigils and not during common Vespers, festal or not, ("if there is not [a vigil] after the inclination, neither does a Litē nor a blessing of loaves take place . . . And when a vigil does not take place, perhaps due to an illness or a lack of brethren . . . they do not perform the blessing of the loaves because this was especially pre-

996. "Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ εὐλογήσας . . ."
997. "Εἴη τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου εὐλογημένον . . ."
998. "Πλούσιοι ἐπτώχευσαν καὶ ἐπείνασαν . . ."
999. PG 155:620a.
1000. PG 155:620b. The partaking of the Artoklasia takes place with sufficient time so that fasting prior to receiving holy communion is maintained.

scribed owing to the fatigue of the vigil," *Dialogue*, chapter 342).[1001] From all these things, we conclude that partaking of the blessed loaves does not presuppose people fasting, given that the Artoklasia normally was performed during the all-night vigil and those taking part in it already had partaken of dinner.

The Artoklasia was transferred from the practice of monasteries also to parish temples. All-night vigils are not done in parishes. Thus, this rite lost its natural liturgical framework and its practical purpose. Liturgically, it was formed into a particular service that combined elements from the monastic Litē, such as the petitions, but simplified according to the form of the ektenēs, and also the prayer of inclination. However, theoretically at least, it remained connected with the Vespers of great feasts and celebrated saints, in whose honor the faithful offer the loaves.

However, this relatively more correct practice was later disturbed with its transfer from the end of Vespers to the morning service of the same day of the feast. The Church silently also in other cases condescends and endures and, in the end, also officially adopts liturgical changes of such a kind, which are imposed by the necessities of the life of the faithful who live in the world. In the case in question, the faithful could not always come to the temple during evenings; they brought loaves in the morning. According to the example of Vespers, the Artoklasia now was placed at the end of Matins, between it and the enarxis of the Divine Liturgy, which in the parishes for reasons again of "oikonomia," was joined to Matins.

The transfer itself, by exception, of the Artoklasia to the end of Matins and the distribution of the sanctified elements after the dismissal of the Divine Liturgy, namely, to people fasting for holy communion, created the mistaken impression, as it is shown from the retrospection into the correct practice, that for someone to partake of the blessed loaves, it is necessary to be fasting. As an answer to the third question, these are the points.[1002]

1001. PG 155:620a–620b.

1002. When both are distributed at the same time, the fasting associated with the antidōron is mistakenly being associated with the Artoklasia. Phountoulēs

Generally, the transfer of Artoklasia to the end of Matins, inasmuch as this was imposed by insurmountable practical necessities, does not present particular disadvantages, certainly aside from the delay that is created by reason of the addition of one more, fortunately short, service, between two long services, Matins and the Divine Liturgy. However, specifically regarding the feast of the Exaltation of the Precious Cross, at the end of the Matins of which the Exaltation is celebrated, I have the opinion that for many reasons the transfer by oikonomia of the Artoklasia from Vespers to Matins must not be put into practice. Namely, aside from the lengthening of the entire service, due to the addition also of another one, a thing that would have as a consequence the hasty celebration and consequently the corruption of them all, the service for the Exaltation of the Precious Cross must keep its prominent central place in the whole order of the day. Such is the theological and liturgical nature of this service, that any other rite that overshadows or that even is placed parallel to the Exaltation, does not fit into the liturgical framework. On this point, our priests must in a timely manner guide the faithful to bring any of their artoklasies[1003] during Vespers, and must bless them at that time, according to the ancient correct taxis. The same should apply for identical reasons also during the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross, although on this day the faithful do not celebrate and there is no possibility that they bring loaves.[1004]

Perhaps an opportunity will not be presented for us to return to the Artoklasia after the exhaustive examination of the subject in connection with the three questions above. Therefore, it would

---

may have missed a point implied by the question, namely, that it has become popular for some loaves being brought in parishes for the Artoklasia to be baked with dairy products and eggs (like a traditional sweet bread such as a tsoureki). This provides a level of complexity when the Artoklasia is celebrated for a feast during a fasting period such as the Annunciation. This issue would not arise in a monastery where the loaves are baked onsite.

1003. "ἀρτοκλασίες," namely the loaves for the Artoklasia.

1004. The feast is in Great Lent and does not have the character of a celebration that is appropriate for an Artoklasia. Phountoulēs is basically stating that no Artoklasia should ever be celebrated on the Sunday of the Veneration of the Cross.

be opportune for a few additional words to be noted regarding the ritual fabric of the modern service that was created in the parishes by a blending of elements from the Litē and the blessing of the loaves. It is not the time for us to judge whether and to what extent this blending is liturgically acceptable; nor also would we have anything to practically gain, since this form has generally prevailed anyway. Nevertheless, it is appropriate to write that two of the petitions of the Litē have not been correctly rendered in the more recent printed editions of our liturgical books. These petitions are different from the usual petitions of the ektenēs and we can find them in all of the old, printed editions of the Euchologia and Hieratika. Their restoration would not only restore the correct practice but would also give variety to the service. The petitions are beautiful and very succinct:

—Σῶσον ὁ Θεός . . .

—Ἔτι δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου ἡμῶν (δεῖνος) καὶ πάσης τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ ἡμῶν ἀδελφότητος καὶ ὑπὲρ πάσης ψυχῆς χριστιανῶν θλιβομένης τε καὶ καταπονουμένης, ἐλέους Θεοῦ καὶ βοηθείας ἐπιδεομένης, σκέπης τοῦ ἁγίου οἴκου τούτου καὶ τῶν κατοικούντων ἐν αὐτῷ (τῆς πόλεως ταύτης καὶ τῶν κατοικούντων ἐν αὐτῇ)· εἰρήνης καὶ καταστάσεως τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου· εὐσταθείας τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ Θεοῦ Ἐκκλησιῶν· σωτηρίας καὶ βοηθείας τῶν μετὰ σπουδῆς καὶ φόβου Θεοῦ κοπιώντων καὶ διακονούντων πατέρων καὶ ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν· ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀπολειφθέντων καὶ τῶν ἐν ἀποδημίαις ὄντων· ἰάσεως τῶν ἐν ἀσθενείαις κατακειμένων· ὑπὲρ ἀνέσεως, μακαρίας μνήμης καὶ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν πάντων τῶν προαπελθόντων εὐσεβῶς πατέρων καὶ ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν τῶν ἐνθάδε κειμένων καὶ ἁπανταχοῦ ὀρθοδόξων· ὑπὲρ ἀναρρύσεως τῶν αἰχμαλώτων καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν τῶν ἐν διακονίαις ὄντων καὶ πάντων τῶν διακονούντων καὶ διακονησάντων ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκκλησίᾳ ταύτῃ, εἴπωμεν.

—Save, O God . . .

—Again we pray for our Archbishop (name) and for all our brotherhood in Christ and for every Christian soul that is afflicted and tormented, in need of the mercy and help of God; for the protection of this holy house and those who dwell therein (of this city and those who dwell therein); for the peace and welfare of the whole world; for the good estate of the holy churches of God; for the salvation and help of our fathers and brethren that labor and minister with zeal and fear of God; for them that are absent and abroad; for the healing of those who lie in infirmity; for the pardon, blessed memory, and remission of all sins of our fathers and brethren that have departed before us the Orthodox here and every where laid to rest; for the deliverance of those held captive and for our brethren that are in service and for all that serve and have served in this holy church, let us say.

—Ἔτι δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ τῶν εὐσεβεστάτων καὶ Θεοφυλάκτων βασιλέων ἡμῶν, κράτους, νίκης, διαμονῆς, ὑγείας, σωτηρίας αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ Κύριον τὸν Θεὸν ἡμῶν ἐπὶ πλέον συνεργῆσαι καὶ κατευοδῶσαι αὐτοὺς ἐν πᾶσι καὶ ὑποτάξαι ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν πάντα ἐχθρὸν καὶ πολέμιον.
—Ἔτι δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ τοῦ διαφυλαχθῆναι
...
—Ἔτι δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ τοῦ εἰσακοῦσαι . . .

—Again we pray for our most pious and God-protected kings, that the Lord our God assists in their dominion, victory, continuance, health, and salvation, and that further he guide them in all things and subject under their feet every enemy and adversary.[1005]
—Again we pray for the protection . . .
—Again we pray that the Lord our God may hearken . . .

274

In the prayer, "Great are you, O Lord . . .,"[1006] of holy baptism and of the Great Hagiasmos, there is the phrase, "You have formed creation out of four elements."[1007] What does this mean?

This prayer is attributed by the manuscripts to Basileios the Great. We do not have other evidence that could prove for us that the prayer is, in fact, a genuine work of this great Father. At any rate, this is a most beautiful and theological prayer, which has many commonalities with the other prayers that are attributed to Basileios the Great. In any case, we will seek the answer to the question above in the works of this Father; namely, in other words, we will seek from the same one to explain for us what he concisely expresses in these seven words.[1008]

According to a theory, which the ancient Pythagorean philosopher Empedoklēs of Akragas (fifth century B.C.) formulated, the world was constituted from a synthesis of four elements, from fire, water, earth, and air. It is noteworthy that Basileios the Great accepted this theory. The most characteristic passage of his works, which refers to this subject, is his *First Homily on the Hexaēmeron* (8) where, when commenting on the first verse of Genesis, "In the beginning, God made the heaven and earth," he sets forth in a very

1005. This petition was most likely included since at the time of this writing Greece was a kingdom.
1006. "Μέγας εἶ, Κύριε . . ."
1007. "Σὺ ἐκ τεσσάρων στοιχείων τὴν κτίσιν συναρμόσας."
1008. The seven words are, "Σὺ ἐκ τεσσάρων στοιχείων τὴν κτίσιν συναρμόσας," (You have formed creation out of four elements).

detailed manner the fitting together of the world "out of four elements" according to this view. We quote here the entire relevant text that is like a commentary on the above phrase of the prayer from baptism. It could be characterized as a proof for the authenticity of the prayer if this theory did not constitute a common topos for that era. Thus, any other author of the prayer would write in this manner, including Basileios the Great.

> 'In the beginning God made heaven and earth.'[1009] From the two ends,[1010] he alluded to the existence of everything, assigning superiority to heaven and declaring earth second in existence. By all means, although there is something in between, it was generated at the same time in these limits. Consequently, even if he might not speak of the elements of fire, water, and air, you perceive with your own comprehension first that everything has also been mixed in everything and you will find water, air, and fire in the earth. If then fire springs out of rocks, fire has also been made to shine abundantly in sparks from iron, which also itself has its source from the earth. Oh, it is also worth marveling how fire existing in bodies lurks without harming; but when summoned on the outside, it is consuming of what up to this time contained it. And well-diggers prove that the nature of water is contained in the earth; and the vapors that have been sent up by the warming sun from its being moist [prove] the nature of air [is contained in the earth] (*Homily on the Hexameron* 1.8).[1011]

1009. Gen 1:1.

1010. "ἐκ δύο τῶν ἄκρων" (ends [of the world).

1011. Stanislas Giet, ed. and trans., *Basile de Césarée. Homélies sur l'hexaéméron*, 2nd ed., SC 26bis (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1968), 116–119; PG 29:20a–20b. A miracle attributed to Saint Spyridōn at the First Ecumenical Council of Nicea (325), regarding a piece of ceramic or brick that was reduced to fire, water, and clay as a representation for the Orthodox teaching on the Holy Trinity, appears consistent with this philosophical view of the elements as mixed within each other. An account of this miracle is not contained in the lives of the Saint or other materials edited in P. van den Ven, *La légende de S. Spyridon évêque de Trimithonte* (Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1953). However, for its reference in a text of Dionysios of Fourna (c. 1670–c. 1744) and place in iconography, see the analysis of Christopher Walter, "Icons of the First Council of Nicaea," *Δελτίον τῆς Χριστιανικῆς Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας* (1991–1992): 218.

275

During the feast of Saint Anna, why is the pericope, Luke 8:16–21, read?

The gospel pericope, Luke 8:16–21, "The Lord said, 'No one lights a lamp . . .,'" (Saturday of the Sixth Week of Luke) is read on the Conception (December 9) and the Dormition of Saint Anna (July 25), as well as on the synaxis of the holy Ancestors of God, Joachim and Anna (September 9), namely, on all the feasts that are connected in any way with the commemoration of the mother of the Theotokos.

The only element of this pericope that can have any connection with this saint and that was obviously the reason this pericope was chosen, is the reference to "the mother and the brothers" of Christ (verses 20–21). It is true that the connection of this pericope and the commemoration of the saint is very superficial and almost non-existent. However, it must be admitted that those who organized the selection for the system of pericopes, in the case in question, faced an essential difficulty, which they attempted to surmount in the best way possible. The Gospel does not speak about Saint Anna. The mention of the relatives of Christ according to the flesh gave some, be it weak, contact point with the subject of the feast.

276

In the Paraklētikē, grave tone, Saturday Vespers, there is the troparion, "In fulfillment of David's prophecy . . ."[1012] What psalm is it about?

The question refers to the fifth troparion (second anatolikon[1013]) of the stichēra of "O Lord, I have cried to you . . ."[1014] of the grave tone. The troparion is as follows:

1012. "Δαυϊτικὴν προφητείαν . . ."

1013. "ἀνατολικόν." According to Savas J. Savas, the naming of these troparia is disputed with some scholars attributing them to various authors (named, Anatolios) and others believing that the mystical name of Christ is being signified by referring to the time of the resurrection. For a discussion, see Savas J. Savas, *Hymnology of the Eastern Orthodox Church* (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1977), 6–7.

1014. "Κύριε ἐκέκραξα πρὸς σέ . . ."

Δαυϊτικὴν προφητείαν ἐκπληρῶν, Χριστὸς μεγαλειότητα, ἐν Σιών, τὴν οἰκείαν Μαθηταῖς ἐξεκάλυψεν, αἰνετὸν δεικνὺς ἑαυτόν, καὶ δοξαζόμενον ἀεί, σὺν Πατρί τε καὶ Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, πρότερον μὲν ἄσαρκον ὡς Λόγον, ὕστερον δὲ δι' ἡμᾶς, σεσαρκωμένον, καὶ νεκρωθέντα ὡς ἄνθρωπον, καὶ ἀναστάντα κατ' ἐξουσίαν ὡς φιλάνθρωπον.

In fulfillment of David's prophecy, in Sion, Christ unveiled his majesty to his disciples, revealing himself as the one who is praised and ever glorified with the Father and the Holy Spirit; before, being without flesh as the Word, but now for us becoming incarnate, being put to death as man, and arising according to his power, as a lover of humankind. [1015]

The reference to the psalm is done freely, for this reason also the search for the precisely corresponding verse by which the hymnographer is inspired, is not so easy. However, it is clear that this is about a messianic psalm ("David's prophecy") in which there must be a prophetic reference concerning the Christ that reveals his majesty in Sion to his disciples, in relation to his eternal existence as the Word of the Father, to his incarnational economy in time, and to his glory after the Passion and Resurrection.

The psalmic prophecy most related is found in Psalm 98, and more precisely in verses 1–3:

1. Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν, ὀργιζέσθωσαν λαοί· ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν χερουβίμ, σαλευθήτω ἡ γῆ.
2. Κύριος ἐν Σιὼν μέγας καὶ ὑψηλός ἐστι ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς λαούς.
3. Ἐξομολογησάσθωσαν τῷ ὀνόματί σου τῷ μεγάλῳ, ὅτι φοβερὸν καὶ ἅγιον ἐστι

1. The Lord reigned, let peoples grow angry! He who sits upon the Cherubim, let the earth be moved.
2. The Lord is great in Sion and he is high over all the peoples.
3. Let them acknowledge your great name, for it is awesome and holy! [1016]

Indeed, there exists a correspondence between the words of the psalm and the verses of the troparion: First, the psalm is attributed by its title to David ("David's"). [1017] It speaks regarding Sion (verse two). The word, "μέγας" (great) (verse two) is changed to the more

1015. Translation modified from Holy Transfiguration Monastery, trans., *The Octoēchos* (Boston: Holy Transfiguration Monastery, 2019), 344.

1016. NETS modified.

1017. "Δαυϊτικήν."

poetic "μεγαλειότητα" (majesty). "Δοξαζόμενον" (glorified) of the troparion obviously is an echo of "ἐξομολογησάσθωσαν" (let them acknowledge) of the psalm's verse three. The references to the eternal existence of the Word, "ἀεί, σὺν Πατρί τε καὶ Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, πρότερον μὲν ἄσαρκον ὡς Λόγον" (ever with the Father and the Holy Spirit; before, being without flesh as the Word), is a theological representation of "ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν χερουβίμ" (He who sits upon the Cherubim) of the psalm's verse one; "ὕστερον δὲ δι' ἡμᾶς, σεσαρκωμένον, καὶ νεκρωθέντα ὡς ἄνθρωπον, καὶ ἀναστάντα κατ' ἐξουσίαν ὡς φιλάνθρωπον" (but now for us becoming incarnate, being put to death as man, and arising according to his power, as a lover of humankind), is not unrelated to "Ὁ Κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν" (the Lord reigned) of verse one.

We must see these verses of the psalm in the light of patristic interpretation, which the hymnographer must have had in mind and from which he draws the content of his troparion. The two more characteristic commentaries are the *Explanation of the Psalms* of Athanasios the Great and that of Theodōrētos of Cyrus. Both these interpreters precisely relate these verses to Christ, to the revelation of his divinity to the apostles, and to his kingdom in the whole world after the Passion and glorious Resurrection. We select the more characteristic phrases:

"The Lord reigned . . . Christ is . . . for he himself is the one who reigns in the end times on the earth and who is carried upon the Cherubim . . . You are the one upon the Cherubim . . . who has become like us.[1018] The Church is Sion, in which Christ is glorified and exalted . . . Great is his name, the Christ" (Athanasios).[1019]

"For the one who endured the cross especially revealed himself as the Master of the whole world, and of the sacred apostles who offered the saving gospel to the nations . . . He says that he the one who is proclaimed by us is both God of the powers above and Lord. He said, 'seated,' as though engaged in a dialogue with human be-

1018. "ὁ γεγονὼς καθ' ἡμᾶς." For an overview of the incarnation in the theology of Saint Athanasios, see Aloysius Grillmeier, *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*, vol. 1 of *Christ in the Christian Tradition*, trans. John Bowden, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975), 308–328.

1019. PG 27:421a–421b.

ings. For the incorporeal nature is incomprehensible and uncircumscribed" (Theodōrētos).[1020]

277

During the service of Sunday Matins, the Gospel book comes out for kissing. If there exists a second Gospel book, must it be placed on the proskynētarion or returned to the holy table?[1021]

The kissing of the sacred Gospel book after the reading of the eōthinon gospel reading during Sunday Matins is attested to by the manuscripts (for example, *Athens 848*) and by Symeōn of Thessaloniki. Indeed, Symeōn also gives an interpretation of this practice and explains the meaning of this kiss: "the priest goes out from the awesome altar, just as though from the tomb (τοῦ μνῆματος), and from the tomb (τοῦ τάφου) of the holy table, holding the Gospel book as an angel, displaying Christ, whom he also just proclaimed. All coming forward prostrate as the disciples and the myrrhbearing women, kiss it, and consequently sing an ode, 'Having beheld the Resurrection of Christ . . .'[1022]" (*Dialogue*, chapter 336).[1023]

The placement of the Gospel book on the proskynētarion is not attested to by the manuscript tradition and it seems that this is later, because it is done neither on the Holy Mountain nor in the Slavic churches. It is very possible that it was introduced into the parishes from reasons of practical necessity. Namely, since the faithful have not yet arrived in the temple during the time that the Gospel book comes out for kissing, it is placed on the proskynētarion in order for

1020. PG 80:1665a, 1664b–1665a. Translation modified from Robert C. Hill, trans., *Theodoret of Cyrus, Commentary on the Psalms, Psalms 73–150,* Fathers of the Church 102 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2001), 140.

1021. Phountoulēs is referring to the modern practice in Greek-speaking churches for the Gospel book to be brought out for the congregation's veneration during Matins and then left in the narthēx of the temple for those faithful who come later in the service or for the Divine Liturgy. This has precipitated a practical necessity to have two Gospel books. In some temples with only one Gospel book, the altar servers are then compelled to retrieve the Gospel at the beginning of the Divine Liturgy for the small entrance.

1022. "Ἀνάστασιν Χριστοῦ θεασάμενοι . . ."

1023. PG 155:608d–609a.

them to kiss it during their arrival. It does not matter if this practice is later. It has fitted perfectly in Sunday's resurrectional framework. The risen Lord, whom the Gospel book represents, is found in the midst of his people during the whole resurrectional day of Sunday and receives the kisses of their honor and love. In this way, the resurrectional and Christocentric character of the sacred day of the Lord is also more emphatically emphasized.

278

During the service of holy baptism must the troparion, "When you were baptized in the Jordan, O Lord . . . ,"[1024] be chanted?

The chanting of the apolytikion of holy Theophany during the service of holy baptism is unknown in the ancient tradition relevant to the performance of this mystery and preserved for us by the liturgical manuscripts and by the testimonies of various Fathers and ecclesiastical authors. In some manuscripts from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the tendency for the introduction of the apolytikion of Theophany or of the Forerunner at the beginning of the service, before the prayers for the catechumens and exorcisms, is encountered for the first time. During the same era and in almost the same manuscripts, attempts for the introduction of suitable troparia into both the service of the first day from the birth of a child and of the fortieth day are also encountered. Therefore, we must include and examine the chanting of "When you were baptized in the Jordan, O Lord . . ." during baptism, in the framework of this whole tendency that influenced liturgical practice and left its traces in some places up until nowadays.

Specifically, in the manuscripts of *Sinai 968* and *Athens 669*, in the service for the first day after the birth of a child, the troparion of the Nativity, "Your nativity, O Christ our God . . ."[1025] is introduced. In the service of the fortieth day, the *Codices Metochiou tou Panagiou Taphou Kōnstantinoupoleōs 8 (182)*, *Athens 664*, and *669*

1024. "Ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ βαπτιζομένου σου, Κύριε . . ."
1025. "Ἡ γέννησίς σου, Χριστὲ ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . ."

provide for the chanting of the apolytikion or kontakion of the Meeting of Christ, ("Hail, full of grace, O Virgin Theotokos . . ."[1026] and "Your birth sanctified a virgin's womb . . ."[1027]); the *Codex Lavras 21* provides for the chanting of the idiomelon of the Meeting of Christ, "Let the gate of heaven open today . . .,"[1028] for male babies and "After you were born . . ."[1029] of the Entrance for females. At baptism, the manuscript of *Athens 669* prefixes the apolytikion and kontakion of Theophany ("When you were baptized in the Jordan, O Lord . . ." and "You appeared today . . ."[1030]), and *Athens 664* the apolytikion of the Forerunner, "The memory of the just . . .,"[1031] "O Baptist of Christ . . .,"[1032] and "By the intercession, O Lord, of all the saints . . .."[1033] Again, in all these services, other manuscripts provide for the chanting of the apolytikion and the kontakion "of the day or of the saint falling on that day" with "By the intercession, O Lord . . ." at the "Glory both now."

Namely, this is about a tendency for the embellishment of the services with the chanting of troparia, the selection of which sometimes happens by chance when the chanting of the troparia of the day is provided for, but at other times on the basis of theological criteria, such as the relationship of the services to the corresponding event of the Lord's life. The correspondence was obvious but is also underscored by the prayers and by the characteristics of the dismissals of feasts of the Lord, which had been introduced in a later period. Between a birth of a child and the Nativity, a fortieth day and the Meeting, a baptism and the Theophany there was always a close connection; these rites were instituted on the basis of and in connection with the events of the Lord's life, which are celebrated during these feasts. The believer is likened, in some manner, to the

1026. "Χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη . . ."
1027. "Ὁ μήτραν παρθενικήν . . ."
1028. "Ἀνοιγέσθω ἡ πύλη . . ."
1029. "Μετὰ τὸ τεχθῆναί σε . . ."
1030. "Ἐπεφάνης σήμερον . . ."
1031. "Μνήμη δικαίου . . ."
1032. "Βαπτιστὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ . . ."
1033. "Τῇ πρεσβείᾳ, Κύριε, πάντων τῶν ἁγίων . . ."

Lord when applying to himself/herself what happened in the life of the Latter on earth.

Specifically, regarding holy baptism, it was not understood during the later period why the prayers of the catechumens and exorcisms did not begin or end in the customary manner of the other services, namely, they did not have a blessing for the enarxis and a dismissal. In later manuscripts and even in printed Euchologia (we spoke regarding this topic in an answer to questions ninety and ninety-one), we detect attempts for their inclusion into the customary liturgical framework by the introduction of "Blessed is our God . . ." and of the trisagion of the enarxis at the start and a dismissal at the end. The chanting of usually three troparia, in this case of Theophany or of the Forerunner and Baptist of the Lord, was also an element itself of an enarxis, customary in other services.

These are the points regarding the cause for the introduction and reason for prefixing "When you were baptized in the Jordan, O Lord . . ." to the service of holy baptism. If the local tradition requires it, it can be preserved inasmuch as, just as we saw, it is consistent with the spirit of the service. However, it does not add anything essential to the celebration of the mystery that is already sufficiently extensive and contains quite a few ornamental elements, so much so that it is not deprived of magnificence and a variety of chanting.

279

Is it correct for troparia to be inserted into the Divine Liturgy that are not provided for by the Typikon?

It is true that in the past, especially in the final Byzantine years and during the period of the Tourkokratia,[1034] the tendency on the one hand presented itself and flourished for the choir to cover with the chanting of troparia every gap that was created in the Divine Liturgy by the reading inaudibly of the priestly prayers; and conversely, again, for the priest to continuously whisper troparia more or less relevant to what was being celebrated, when the chanter prolonged

1034. The Ottoman rule of former Byzantine territory, particularly the area now comprising the modern country of Greece.

the chanting. This tendency receded somewhat later, and relatively few things remained in our present liturgical books.

From these, the megalynarion of the Theotokos ("It is truly meet . . ."[1035] or any other) was permanently incorporated into the Divine Liturgy, which was first introduced as an encomium of the Theotokos and was said by the priest before or after the mention of her name after the consecration of the precious gifts. Shortly afterward, it became prevalent for it to be chanted by the choir in order for the remainder of the prayer of the anaphora that was said inaudibly to be covered. An attempt for the introduction of the megalynarion for the celebrated saint fortunately did not succeed. The only one that proved to be more resilient was the megalynarion for Basileios the Great ("Christ's revealer of heavenly things . . ."),[1036] which is chanted almost everywhere on January first.[1037] Another point, at which quite a bit of freedom became prevalent, is the chanting of apolytikia after the entrance. An aim of the chanting also again was the expression of honor to certain saints and the covering of the prayer of the trisagion that was read inaudibly during this time. On the Holy Mountain even nowadays, they chant many troparia. In any case, even here excesses must be avoided. The Typikon provides the golden mean in these cases. The expressions of our piety in divine worship must be subject to its rules lest they are changed into liturgical neoplasms.

280

I attended a marriage in a large city, and I noticed that many elements of the service were omitted, such as the ektenēs, the "Our Father," the blessing of the cup, various prayers, and so forth. Is this arbitrary omission permitted? Where will it lead us?

1035. "Ἄξιόν ἐστιν . . ."

1036. "Τὸν οὐρανοφάντορα τοῦ Χριστοῦ . . ."

1037. In older editions of the Enkolpion of the Apostolikē Diakonia, the chanting of the megalynarion is provided for after the exclamation, "And remember those whom each of us has in mind and all men and women" (Καὶ ὧν ἕκαστος κατὰ διάνοιαν ἔχει, καὶ πάντων καὶ πασῶν), usually in plagal of the fourth tone or variants in the second tone, irrespective of the tone for the week.

In the answers to questions 254 and 255 that referred to the celebration of holy baptism, we discussed the pastoral and liturgical problems that are present in large cities due to the disproportionate increase of the population, chiefly after the last war.[1038] As much as we wish to be faithful upholders of our liturgical taxis and opposed to every omission or innovation, we ought to be fair to those people who undertook the heavy burden of pastoral service in the parishes of the large cities. Blame concerning impiety or lack of a sense of responsibility contrary to liturgical taxis cannot be ascribed to them in good conscience. At the very least, it is not permitted for us to view the priests of small parishes, who do not encounter problems similar to the latter, as more pious than others. God alone knows the secrets of people's hearts; from what is seen, among the clergy of large cities there also exist most holy and pious clergymen, inflamed by care for their flock and serving the sacred mysteries in the fear of God and much piety. However, many times in liturgical practice, they also "conform" to a prevailing "abridged" (for us thus to characterize it) celebration of the sacred services. Certainly, in this way some distance is created between the liturgical Typikon theoretically in force and the liturgical book on the one hand, and the liturgical practice on the other. Nowadays, are the ektenēs after the gospel reading and the petitions for the catechumens said during the Divine Liturgy? Are the typika chanted? Are all the canons of Matins, the kathismata of the Psalter, the stichologia of the odes, the psalms of lauds, and the psalms of Lamp-lighting chanted? The Typikon comes in after the fact to make official the innovations that have already been made. Also, again, other problems are generated from the use of the older or newer liturgical books, as well as which one is the more correct practice. Questions like those which we dealt with many times: The Hagiasmos without the consecratory prayer, as it is found in the "occasional" services, or with the consecratory prayer? The canon of Pascha entire or only the katabasies during the funeral service of Renewal Week? And so on. With these things that we are writing, we do not wish to justify the arbitrary omissions and

1038. Phountoulēs is referring to the Second World War and the Greek civil war afterwards (1940–1949).

violations of the Typikon in the name of liturgical development. But simply for us to note a reality that is not addressed either always opportunely or correctly.

The celebration of the service of marriage especially presents a variety of problems of a different origin, which have not been thoroughly studied nor formally addressed. Solutions are customarily given extemporaneously, certainly not by the priests who comfortably celebrate one wedding per month or even one per Sunday, but by those who are forced to celebrate an entire series of crownings within a pre-determined narrow timeframe. A radical solution, which would give a way out for at least most of the problems, would be the common celebration of the mystery for all the intending spouses on one day in one or two ceremonies. The mystery would be celebrated comfortably and radiantly, without being rushed and without omissions. Unfortunately, despite sixty generations of Christian life, idolatry has not, according to the beautiful phrase of the Liturgy of Saint Markos, been "utterly"[1039] uprooted from the world and various superstitions still govern the life of the faithful. Matters will also follow along this course as long as a bride will be afraid to see another bride.[1040] Unfortunately, the "rational sheep" oftentimes shepherd the shepherds instead of being shepherded by them. If their celebration in certain temples within a parish, which are especially preferred for marriages, was added to these things, we understand what an impasse the celebration of a series of similar half-hourly services creates for the priests of these temples.[1041]

1039. "τὴν εἰδωλολατρείαν τέλεον ἐκρίζωσον ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου." See the editions of Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Θεῖαι Λειτουργίαι*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 3′ (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 23, and Geoffrey J. Cuming, ed., *The Liturgy of Saint Mark*, OCA 234 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990), 34.

1040. In some areas of Greece, there is a superstition that a bride should not see another bride on the day of her wedding.

1041. In the Church of Greece, individual parishes often have several temples or side-chapels. These temples may be favored for weddings due to their location or architectural beauty, so much so that faithful from outside of the parish will often arrange their marriages in them and thus increase the liturgical demands on clergy. The reference to "similar half hour services" is meant to include both baptisms and weddings that are repeated in succession.

The problem of the benediction of marriage is even "esoteric"—purely liturgical. As it presents itself nowadays in our Euchologia, the service consists of two services, the betrothal and the crowning, which were made to be celebrated separately. Nowadays, for various reasons they are celebrated consecutively. Thus, they exist now in an essentially unified service, apart from similar elements in prayers, the litany of peace twice, the ektenēs twice, and two dismissals.

Perhaps it will appear likewise strange that the present form of these services is not Byzantine–Constantinopolitan, but from Southern Italy and the islands, where it was published in the first printed Euchologia of Venice and thus came to prevail with repeated reprintings in the entire Orthodox Church.[1042] The Byzantine service differs from the one in use, because it is appreciably shorter. Speaking more broadly, as attested to by all the ancient manuscripts, missing from the former one[1043] are the long prayer of betrothal, "O Lord our God, who accompanied the servant of the patriarch Abraham to Mesopotamia . . .,"[1044] and the two long prayers at the beginning of the service of marriage, "O God, the undefiled one . . ."[1045] and "Blessed are you, O Lord our God, the celebrant of mystical . . .."[1046] Thus, apart from the litany of peace and the presentation of the rings, the service of betrothal only had the two most ancient and brief prayers, "O God eternal . . ."[1047] and "O Lord our God, who espoused the Church as a pure virgin from the gentiles . . .,"[1048] and the service of crowning had the entrance psalm, the litany of peace, the constitutive prayer of marriage, "Holy God, who fashioned humanity from dust . . .,"[1049] the crowning, and the remainders of the particular Divine Liturgy, complete or presanctified. From these

1042. During the period in question, the printing of liturgical books was restricted in the Ottoman Empire and consequently Venice became one of the centers for the publication of liturgical texts.

1043. Namely, the Byzantine service.

1044. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τῷ παιδὶ τοῦ Πατριάρχου Ἀβραὰμ συμπορευθεὶς ἐν τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ . . ."

1045. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἄχραντος . . ."

1046. "Εὐλογητὸς εἶ Κύριε, ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τοῦ μυστικοῦ . . ."

1047. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ αἰώνιος . . ."

1048. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ τὴν ἐξ ἐθνῶν . . ."

1049. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἅγιος, ὁ πλάσας ἐκ χοὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον . . ."

were preserved, after the detachment of marriage from the Divine Liturgy, the readings, the ektenēs with its prayer ("O Lord our God, who in your saving economy . . ."),[1050] the plērōtika with the "Our Father," the blessing of the common cup, the sacred dance, and the dismissal prayers and blessings.

On the basis of these facts of the liturgical tradition, if the Church judged it meaningful and necessary, it could officially make an adjustment of the service of marriage. The omissions that are done arbitrarily, especially if they are of such an extent and of such a form as these that the questioner observed, undoubtedly lead to a destruction of the service and to inappropriate solutions, which the pious correspondent quite rightly wonders where in the end they will lead us.

281

In the Divine Liturgy, why do the petitions, "That the whole day . . . An angel of peace . . .,"[1051] and so forth, exist twice? Must they be said twice? If only once, which of the two?

The question is quite complicated. The first thing that we should verify is whether this double recitation of petitions is attested to by the manuscript tradition of our Liturgies. Without any reservations, the answer is affirmative. All of the printed texts, Hieratika and Euchologia, and all of the manuscripts of the two Byzantine Liturgies of Basileios the Great and of the sacred Chrysostomos, from the most ancient codex, the *Barberini Euchologion 336* from the end of the eighth century, have the petitions twice, in their present place, namely, after the placement of the precious gifts on the holy table and after the prayer of the anaphora.

The issue is admittedly strange because in no service are the same elements said twice. And even when the structure of the service necessitates a repetition of a synaptē for the introduction of a new liturgical section, the entire synaptē is said only the first time, being abbreviated all the other times. Thus, in the Matins and in the Di-

1050. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐν τῇ σωτηριώδει σου οἰκονομίᾳ . . ."
1051. "Τὴν ἡμέραν πᾶσαν . . . Ἄγγελον εἰρήνης . . ."

vine Liturgy, we have the litany of peace at the beginning and the small synaptē where the taxis would necessitate its repetition. We have the petitions in the Divine Liturgy and their abbreviated form at its end ("That the whole day . . .[1052] having asked, ourselves . . .[1053] let us commend . . ."[1054]). In the related Liturgies of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, Saint Iakōvos, and the Armenian Liturgy, the petitions exist only once. By analogy, they also ought to have been originally said only once in both Byzantine Liturgies. The logical structure of our Liturgies necessitates this. It is more than certain that the petitions existed only once in these Liturgies, just as it is equally certain that already from the eighth century it became prevalent for them to be said twice.

We can infer from the ancient Liturgies and from the testimony of Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos where the original place of the petitions was. According to the testimony of this Father, (*Homily on 2 Corinthians* 2:8) the petitions were said after the gospel reading and before the dismissal of the catechumens.[1055] We also encounter them in precisely the same place in the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos and in the Armenian Liturgy. During the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, they were also said once after the gospel reading and at the end of the entreaties for the catechumens and precisely before the dismissal of their first rank. Afterwards, those possessed by impure spirits, the phōtizomenoi, and those under penance were dismissed. This detail acquires significance if we view it within its whole liturgical framework and in connection with the use of the petitions also in other services outside of the Divine Liturgy. We encounter them in the ancient "asmatic" parish services at the end of the services, just as also in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, but after the departure of the catechumens and before the dismissal of the faithful. In the monastic Matins, we find them at the end of the service. In the monastic Vespers, at that point, which in the period they were placed there, the end of the service was signified. It is still characteristic that in most

1052. "Τὴν ἡμέραν πᾶσαν . . ."
1053. "αἰτησάμενοι, ἑαυτούς . . ."
1054. "παραθώμεθα . . ."
1055. *PG* 61:403–404.

cases they are introduced by a special diaconal command that calls for the completion of prayer ("Let us complete our prayer to the Lord"),[1056] which precisely shows that the service is at its conclusion. The content of the petitions agrees with their liturgical position, which we noted above. The deacon calls for the faithful to seek from God the day as peaceful and sinless, an angel as a guardian and guide, things good and profitable for their souls, and a life in repentance, within an eschatological framework of an expectation for a peaceful end and appearance before the judgment seat of Christ.[1057] In other words, they constitute a kind of transition from the domain of the worship of God, for which the faithful assembled, to their way of life in the world and the struggle of life, in which directly and immediately they will be engaged. Therefore, they were very logically placed at the end of the synaxis and before the dismissal of the first group of those attending, the catechumens. They were also undoubtedly found there in the Byzantine Liturgies in their original form.

What contributed for them to be transferred from the end of the synaxis, the so-called "liturgy of the catechumens," to the Eucharistic synaxis as such, the so-called "liturgy of the faithful"? It is very likely that this took place in a period, where, since catechumens were absent, the petitions that were intended for them began to fall into disuse. During that period of liturgical zenith and creativity, it was self-evident that inasmuch as the catechumens were not dismissed since they were no longer present at the synaxis, the petitions that accompanied their dismissal did not serve their liturgical aim and ought to find another suitable place. There were fluctuations in this search. It originally appears that they were put after the placement of the gifts upon the holy table where there was an ektenēs deēsis[1058] which survives in the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos.[1059] In the Byzantine Liturgies, it has been abbreviated ("Let us complete . . . For the pre-

1056. "Πληρώσωμεν τὴν δέησιν ἡμῶν τῷ Κυρίῳ."

1057. "πρὸ τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ."

1058. "μία ἐκτενὴς δέησις." A long series of petitions.

1059. B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 72–76.

cious gifts set forth . . .[1060] For this holy house . . .[1061] For our deliverance . . .[1062] Help . . .[1063]") because in the meantime the Liturgy had developed further, and the litany of peace was transferred first before the trisagion hymn and a little later before the antiphons. Therefore, in this gap, the petitions found a shelter following their separation from the ektenēs after the gospel reading.

In a somewhat later period, the petitions were also put after the consecration of the precious gifts in a new gap that was created in the place where earlier the diptychs were recited by the deacon. A short synaptē already existed there, just as it is precisely encountered in the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, where it concluded the anaphora and the diptychs, and introduced the preparatory prayers for holy communion ("Having commemorated all the saints . . .[1064] For the precious gifts offered and consecrated . . .[1065] That our God, the lover of humankind . . .[1066] Having asked for the unity of faith . . .[1067]").[1068] With the later custom of reading prayers inaudibly, this synaptē proved insufficient to cover the inaudible reading of a considerably extended prayer before the "Our Father." All these things, and perhaps the influence of the Presanctified, which has at this point the plērōtika and the petitions—namely, in one composite place that not only corresponds to the synaptē after the placement of the precious gifts on the holy table, but also to that after the prayer of the anaphora—resulted in the petitions also being placed there.

Perhaps this is about a compromise of two traditions that irrespectively of one another placed the petitions, the one before and the other after the prayer of the anaphora, and later practice wished to accommodate when adopting both solutions in the manner also

1060. "Ὑπὲρ τῶν προτεθέντων . . ."
1061. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου οἴκου . . ."
1062. "Ὑπὲρ τοῦ ρυσθῆναι . . ."
1063. "Ἀντιλαβοῦ . . ."
1064. "Πάντων τῶν ἁγίων μνημονεύσαντες . . ."
1065. "Ὑπὲρ τῶν προσκομισθέντων καὶ ἁγιασθέντων τιμίων Δώρων . . ."
1066. "Ὅπως ὁ φιλάνθρωπος Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . ."
1067. "Τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως . . ."
1068. B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 108.

well-known from other instances. Thus, the petitions were found twice in the Divine Liturgy.

During recent years, the tendency for the petitions to be said only once began and tends to become widespread. Apart from the argument that they were said here twice for twelve centuries, no one will be able to find another one. On the contrary, the more ancient tradition, the ancient Liturgies, and the logical treatment of the matter are an argument for the opposite. And even if we still did not desire it, the practice is steadily moving in this direction. However, when is it more correct for them to be said, before or after the consecration of the precious gifts? The preferences of our celebrants are divided. Those who prefer the recitation of the petitions after the consecration usually bring forward the pious argument that the Lord is present at that time through the mysteries and the time is more suitable for use to address our prayers to Him. They will be more acceptable at that time. In any case, the argument is influenced by the Eucharistic devotions of the West, which even by the Westerners themselves nowadays are seen as excessive and theologically unfounded. Christ is always invisibly present in the synaxis of the faithful and receives their petitions. In any event, divine worship has as a condition and presupposition its offering in Christ and the Holy Spirit to the Father. The consecration of the precious gifts does not take place in order for us to have Christ present and to glorify Him or to pray to Him, but in order for the faithful to partake of communion, to be united through the mysteries, and to be united with him. The prayers both before and after the consecration are addressed to God the Father through Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit. The ancient Liturgies, just as also the Byzantine ones, before the insertion of the petitions at this point, precisely show the correct course of liturgical prayer. After the anaphora, they hasten to holy communion. They have the pertinent diaconal command, the preparatory prayer for holy communion that introduces the "Our Father," also itself with a Eucharistic meaning ("give us this day our daily bread"), and the prayer of inclination which is essentially a blessing for worthy communion. In

this case, the diaconal petitions after the conclusion of the diptychs ("Having commemorated all the saints") and the introductory exhortation ("Again and again in peace, let us pray to the Lord"),[1069] are three, according to the sacredness of the number: "For the precious gifts offered and consecrated . . .," "That our God, the lover of humankind . . .," and "Having asked for the unity of the faith . . .." The others: "For our deliverance . . .," and "Help . . .," are the inserted diaconal petitions, ones according to custom, and petitions that provide for the covering of the long prayer said inaudibly. These certainly cause a disruption and an interruption of the progress of the liturgical prayer. The incision must be made at the correct point: "That our God, the lover of humankind . . . let us pray"[1070]—"Having asked for the unity of the faith . . .."[1071]

On the other hand, the correct place for the petitions is found in the continuation of the plērōtika after the great entrance. The petitions in all instances are introduced after "Let us complete . . .," very logically, just as we saw at the beginning, inasmuch as their content is supplementary of all the prayers of the Church concerning the daily needs of the faithful. From there and beyond, another theme begins. The great and the only theme of the Holy Eucharist, namely, the celebration of the mystery and the participation of the faithful in it through holy communion.[1072]

1069. "Ἔτι καὶ ἔτι ἐν εἰρήνῃ τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."

1070. "Ὅπως ὁ φιλάνθρωπος Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . .δεηθῶμεν"

1071. "Τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς πίστεως . . ."

1072. The liturgical suggestions of Phountoulēs appear to be partially adopted by the Church of Greece in the Hieratikon of the Apostolikē Diakonia (2019), where on pages 136–137, the petitions being suggested for excision are bracketed and a footnote references the work of Trempelas and Phountoulēs in suggesting that their former inclusion was due to the influence of the Presanctified. However, this solution stops short of actually removing them and gives the appearance that they are optional. If removed, the petitions would be by default located at the plērōtika after the great entrance. An almost identical approach is taken in the most recent edition of the Hieratikon of the Ecumenical Patriarchate (2020) on pages 197–198 with brackets around the petitions and a footnote referencing Trempelas and Phountoulēs.

282

During the service of the First Salutations, why is a gospel read, while during the others, not? Does this gospel reading have any relation to the miracle of Saint Theodōros and the kolyba ("fruit . . . much fruit")[1073] or to the Salutations?

The gospel reading, which is read during the service of the First Salutations (John 15:1–7), has no relation to Saint Theodōros of Tyre and the kolyba, nor to the Salutations, nor even, if we wish to speak strictly, also to Compline. The repetition of the word, "fruit"[1074] (verses 2, 4, 5)—which one would assume intimates some relationship of this pericope to the "fruits" that are offered by the faithful in remembrance of the miracle of Saint Theodōros, namely, the wheat/kolyba—is entirely coincidental. Moreover, in the pericope, the "fruits" mean fruits of the vine, namely, the grapes, inasmuch as it speaks expressly concerning a vine and branches. It also again cannot have a relation to the Salutations, because then also all the other services of the Salutations, by analogy, should have gospel readings, while, it is well known, they do not, and because the chanting of the Salutations during Fridays of the Fast is much later than the introduction of these readings, as seen from the evidence of the ancient codices. But also, the relation of these readings is entirely coincidental to the services of Compline.

The pericope for the Friday of the first week of the Fast constitutes the last of a small series of five pericopes that bear the general title/standard rubric: "Gospel readings which are read in the vigils of the first week of the Fast." Nowadays, they are read at the end of the service of the Great or Small (Friday) Compline during these days, immediately after the series of prayers, "O spotless, undefiled . . .,"[1075] and so forth, and before the blessing of the prayer of inclination of the dismissal. This liturgical place for the gospel reading obviously shows that it has no organic connection or standard integration in the service of Compline but is inserted into it in a quite

1073. "καρπόν . . . καρπὸν πολύν."
1074. "καρπός."
1075. "Ἄσπιλε, ἀμόλυντε . . ."

disjointed and superficial manner. On the other hand, the reading of these gospel pericopes is organically configured in the liturgical structure of another old service that nowadays has fallen into disuse. This is about the "asmatic" service of the Pannychis,[1076] which was celebrated in parish temples of the Byzantine empire before the prevalence of the monastic Jerusalemite service of Compline. It was originally celebrated on the evening of all days of the year. Its celebration was later limited only to great feasts, Great Lent, and Great Week. Finally, it was preserved in its penitential form for the first five days of the first week of the Fast. A remnant of this practice is the series of gospel pericopes that were preserved in our liturgical books in use, in the gospel readings, where also their reading was preserved in the monastic service of Compline in parallel to the Pannychis. The "asmatic" Pannychis is not an all-night service, as its name might mislead us to assume,[1077] but a relatively short service, the celebration of which does not last more than one hour. In other words, the Pannychis was an evening service, which was celebrated after supper, as a kind of small vigil, a parish Compline, which also had quite a few things in common with the monastic Great Compline, such as Psalm 90 ("He who lives by the help of the Most High . . ."),[1078] the hymn, "As a bodiless nature, the Cherubim . . .,"[1079] and so forth. Therefore, it was natural for the service that replaced the "asmatic" Pannychis in the parishes to also preserve certain of its elements just as happened in this case with the gospel readings. We have a parallel phenomenon in the preservation of the reading from the "asmatic" Trithektē in the monastic Sixth Hour of Great Lent, and even the prayers of the "asmatic" Vespers and Matins in the corresponding monastic services in use nowadays.[1080]

1076. *"παννυχίς."*

1077. In Greek, the term, *"παννυχίς,"* is composed from the words, *πᾶσα* (all) and *νύξ* (night).

1078. *"Ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν βοηθείᾳ τοῦ Ὑψίστου . . ."*

1079. *"Ἡ ἀσώματος φύσις . . ."*

1080. For studies of the Pannychis, Miguel Arranz, see "Les prières presbytérales de la 'Pannychis' de l'ancien Euchologe byzantine et la 'Panikhida' des défunts," *OCP* 40 (1974): 314–343 and *OCP* 41 (1975): 119–139; and Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Ἀκολουθίαι τοῦ Νυχθημέρου, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 1'* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 45–82. Also known

The gospel readings for the services of the Pannychis for the first week of the Fast have prayer as a common theme, which is one of the basic themes for the period of Lent. The pericope in question was obviously selected for its final verse, "whatever you wish, ask and it shall be done for you" (verse 7). Requiring us to conclude this as a reason for its preference is its comparative examination with the other four preceding pericopes, which were prescribed for the Pannychides[1081] of the other days of the first week of the Fast: Luke 21:8–36 (verse 36), Matthew 6:1–13 (verses 5–13), Mark 11:22–26 and Matthew 7:7–8 (verses 24–26 and the verses of Matthew), Matthew 7:7–11 (all the verses), and John 15:1–7 (verse 7).

283

During the enarxis of the Divine Liturgy, when the priest says, "Blessed is the kingdom . . .," before he traces a sign of the cross with the Gospel book, how does he "elevate" the Gospel book? Does he elevate it above his head?

The manuscripts and old printed Euchologia and Hieratika do not tell us anything relevant. The strange thing also is that the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Patriarch Philotheos, while it describes in detail the liturgical taxis of that era (fourteenth century), does not say anything more on this point than what the old manuscripts state: "The priest [says or exclaims or in an exclamatory manner],[1082] 'Blessed is the kingdom . . ..'" No mention is made either regarding an elevation of the Gospel book, or regarding the crosswise sealing with it of the altar table, which is attested to by the modern printed editions. In some later manuscripts, the especially festive manner is underscored in which the blessing of the enarxis ought to be delivered; the priest recited it "with a clear

---

as the "τριτοέκτη," for studies of the Trithektē, see: M. Arranz, "Les prières presbytérales de la Tritoekti de l'ancien Euchologe byzantin," *OCP* 43 (1977): 70–93, 335–354; and Ἰωάννης Φουντούλης, *Ἀκολουθίαι τοῦ Νυχθημέρου*, Κείμενα Λειτουργικῆς, Τεῦχος 1' (Θεσσαλονίκη: Μέλισσα, 1994), 11–44.

1081. The plural of Pannychis.

1082. "λέγει ἢ ἐκφωνεῖ ἢ ἐκφώνως."

voice, with fear"[1083] or "clearly and with a loud voice"[1084] or "elevating the voice"[1085] (see the *Codices National Library of Athens 749, 751, 765, 766, 770*, and others). The sacred commentators on the Divine Liturgy also precisely noted the theological importance of this festive enarxis, but do not make mention of the elevation of the Gospel book or the sealing of the altar with it.

However, in any case, the sealing by the Gospel book is done everywhere, a fact which shows that this concerns a quite old custom, which with the existing evidence is not possible to be determined when precisely it was introduced. On the contrary, the elevation of the Gospel book as it is done by some priests nowadays, neither is attested to by the relevant tradition, nor is commonly prevalent. The term, "he elevates"[1086] (the Gospel book), which is encountered in the modern liturgical books, must be interpreted in the light of the handed-down taxis, which this standard rubric codifies. Namely, the term, "he elevates" must have the meaning of "he raises"[1087]—"he lifts"[1088]—"he holds in his hands"[1089]—the Gospel book that is lying on the holy table, not for any other reason but that he traces with it the sign of the cross on the holy table or the closed antimēnsion. Father Gervasios Paraskevopoulos of blessed memory, *Interpretative Overview on the Divine Liturgy*, Patras 1958, p. 40, mentions and adopts, obviously for reasons of piety, an actual elevation of the Gospel book "perpendicularly above the crown of the head" of the priest.[1090] Surely then, we are dealing with a pious misunderstanding. The term, "he elevates" in the standard rubrics of the manuscripts refers to the tone of the priest's voice and not to the Gospel book.

1083. "λαμπρᾷ τῇ φωνῇ, μετὰ φόβου."
1084. "λαμπρῶς καὶ μεγαλοφώνως."
1085. "ὑψῶν τὴν φωνήν."
1086. "ὑψοῖ."
1087. "ἐγείρει."
1088. "σηκώνει."
1089. "κρατεῖ στὰ χέρια."
1090. Γερβάσιος Χαρ. Παρασκευόπουλος, *Ἑρμηνευτικὴ ἐπιστασία ἐπὶ τῆς θείας λειτουργίας* (Πάτραι: n.p., 1958), 40.

284

After the reading of the sacred Gospel book during the Divine Liturgy, does the celebrant alone kiss it or is it permitted for us to also give it to the people for a kiss?

According to the practice prevailing nowadays, during the Divine Liturgy after the reading of the gospel pericope, the deacon (or priest) who reads it kisses the sacred Gospel book, as it is open. While closed, the priest or hierarch who receives it at the beautiful gate kisses the sacred book. The kissing of the Gospel book by the one who also reads is not attested to by the manuscripts, but the kissing of it by the priest who receives it is attested to, already in the twelfth century, by the *Codex Sinai 1020*, "And after the completion [of the reading of the Gospel book] the deacon departs to the priest and the priest kisses the Gospel book." In the hierarchical Liturgy, this practice is likewise attested to by the manuscripts; after the reading of the Gospel book, the hierarch descended from his synthronon (where while standing he heard the gospel reading) "the deacon who read the Gospel book, after descending from the ambōn, approaches the hierarch, who just descended from the synthronon and is near the holy table, and gives him the Gospel book to be kissed. After kissing it and saying to the deacon, 'May you be saved'[1091] and blessing him, he stands . . ." (*Codices Athens 754, Hagiou Saba 362*).

However, while the kissing of the Gospel book by the celebrating priest or hierarch is described in such detail by the manuscripts as we saw, no mention anywhere is made concerning its kissing also by the people. Therefore, was the Gospel book also offered to the people for kissing after its reading? The only clear evidence is given to us by the patristic work, *Oration containing all ecclesiastical history and a detailed narration of all performed in the Divine Sacred-Service*, which is attributed to Sōphronios of Jerusalem: "After the reading, the reader closes it ["the command,"[1092] namely, the Gospel book], he comes down while allowing all to kiss it as sons" (chapter 18).[1093]

1091. "Σωθείης."

1092. "τὴν κέλευσιν."

1093. PG 87:3997d. The text in Phountoulēs has the word, "he comes down" (κατέρχεται), instead of "he comes/goes over" (μετέρχεται) in Migne.

Concerning the liturgical forms of the West, we have many witnesses that already from the tenth century and up until the eighteenth century, apart from the celebrants, the other clergy and the laity who were present at the Divine Liturgy also kissed the Gospel book after its reading. The same also in the Liturgy of the Copts of Egypt; the priests kissed the open Gospel book, and the people while it was wrapped in a special veil.

All these things in combination with the testimony of Sōphronios demonstrate that the same regime was also applied in our regions, at least locally.[1094] Proof of this is the living tradition that was preserved up until our days. The oldest people remember that many drew near the priest during the reading of the Gospel book, bowed their heads or bent their knees under the Gospel, and afterward all kissed it. Nowadays, especially in villages or in private Liturgies, the same thing is done, but on a smaller scale.[1095] It has almost disappeared in cities. The kissing of the Gospel book, which is done during the reading of Psalm 50 in Sunday Matins, perhaps came from the transfer of the kissing of the Gospel book of the Di-

---

The former reading is consistent with the fact that in the PG text the reader is also described as ascending the ambōn in order to read. According to René Bornert, this liturgical commentary falsely attributed to Sōphronios (possibly Saint Sōphronios of Jerusalem, r. 633–638), most likely dates to the twelfth century, but not later than the thirteenth or earlier than the eleventh. Although variously titled, the manuscript contained in *Vaticanus Ottobonianus* 459 was the basis for its publication in Migne, PG 87:3981b–4001b. Phountoulēs most likely referenced this edition. For a discussion of the commentary, see René Bornert, *Les commentaires byzantins de la Divine Liturgie VIIe au XVe siècle* (Paris: Institut français d'études byzantines, 1966), 210–211.

1094. The Church of Greece.

1095. As practiced presently, congregants will place their heads under the Gospel book as it is being read. In the Church of Greece, so-called "private Liturgies" are celebrated in small chapels on private lands or those belonging to parishes and monasteries. These Liturgies are celebrated on the basis of *ad hoc* requests from the faithful, often out of affinity or spiritual obligation to the saint for whom the chapel is dedicated. Although these *ad hoc* Liturgies are technically open to others, they are not part of the official parish calendar nor even made known to other congregants. The phrase "we opened the church" (ἀνοίξαμε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν) is an expression often heard in villages after a family has arranged and provided for the celebration of such a Liturgy, especially in the case of chapels not normally used.

vine Liturgy. However, perhaps we have the same practice in both these readings of the Gospel book, but while in Matins the kissing was preserved, it was curtailed in Liturgy presumably because of the disorder that the movement of the faithful caused.[1096]

Nowadays also many of the younger priests especially do not look "favorably" on the kissing of the Gospel book during the Divine Liturgy, precisely due to the movements of the faithful, the delay, even the hiatus, which is caused in the service, since the chanting of some hymn is not provided for during that time, such as in Sunday Matins, which covers the time of the kissing. In any case, this question is not so acute as is thought by some since little by little the practice is declining on its own and step-by-step tending to disappear. And where it is even preserved, there are so few who approach that the danger of delay, hiatus, or disorder is limited to the minimum. I do not think that it would be advisable for the priest to deny kissing to the faithful who are approaching. This is about a remnant of an old practice that we must view with sympathy. Moreover, it has its meaning; it is an expression of filial honor and love, just as we saw in the explanation of Sōphronios ("to be kissed as sons"), and a sanctifying contact of the faithful with Christ who speaks and is represented by the sacred Gospel book, since through it, the believer is prepared and cleansed in advance "before the great sanctification of the mysteries" (Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 16 and 22).[1097]

1096. Phountoulēs has also emphasized elsewhere the tendency and pressure to shorten services in general. In addition, in the Church of Greece, there is generally low attendance of Matins to the extent that Phountoulēs noted the transfer of the gospel reading later in the service to ensure its hearing. Consequently, the preservation of the kissing of the Gospel book during Matins may also be due to the fact that its veneration would not significantly lengthen the service, unlike the Liturgy, where even the prayers for the catechumens, for example, are omitted in many parishes, and the Cherubic hymn follows almost immediately after the readings.

1097. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 16.2, 22.4 (SC 4bis:130–131, 154–157).

285

During the litany of peace and the small synaptes, when the deacon or priest says, "Commemorating our most holy, pure . . .,"[1098] the chanters insert and chant "Most holy Theotokos, save us."[1099] Is this correct? Is it perhaps also improper dogmatically, and must "Most holy Theotokos, intercede for us"[1100] be said in this instance for this reason, as well as in other instances?

The question has two parts. The first part concerns the correctness of the insertion, "Most holy Theotokos, save us," at the synaptes and the second the dogmatic accuracy of this acclamation. We will begin from the second point, which constitutes a presupposition, as might be expected, for the answer to the first.

1. "Most holy Theotokos, save us" which is chanted, as is well known, not only at the synaptes, but also instead of a (biblical) verse before the troparia in the canons of the Theotokos as well as in some other cases, is considered by many theologizing chanters and priests as dogmatically inaccurate and for this reason to be rejected. It is corrected by some to "Most holy Theotokos, intercede for us." Thus, we hear it in certain temples and sometimes also from broadcasts of radio stations, especially during the service of the Salutations during Great Lent. The argument is well-known; salvation is granted to man only from God and from no one else. He himself says it expressly through the mouth of the prophet Isaiah, "There is no righteous one or savior except me" (Isaiah 45:21).[1101] Christ is the savior, the only savior of humankind. Also, according to the words of the apostle Peter, "there is no salvation in any other, for there is no other name given under heaven among humankind by which we must be saved" (Acts 4:12). However, in a parallel manner, also in the same sense, namely, not of salvation from a danger or from ne-

1098. "Τῆς παναγίας ἀχράντου . . ."
1099. "Ὑπεραγία Θεοτόκε, σῶσον ἡμᾶς."
1100. "Ὑπεραγία Θεοτόκε, πρέσβευε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν."
1101 In the text, the Scripture was erroneously cited as Isaiah 45:22.

cessity, as we usually also employ the word nowadays, but in the special sense of the eternal spiritual salvation of humanity we use the verb "I save" (σώζω) and the word "salvation" (σωτηρία) in the holy Scripture itself, not only about God or more specifically the Lord Jesus Christ, but also about people, apostles, or the faithful, who by their prayers or their teaching contribute to people being saved. Thus, the believing wife or the believing husband saves her/his unbelieving spouse (1 Cor 7:16), the apostle Paul saves those who believe in his preaching (Rom 11:14 and 1 Cor 9:22), Timothy through his example and teaching will save both himself and "the ones hearing" (1 Tim 4:16). "He who turns a sinner from the error of his way will save his soul from death" (Jas 5:20); and the faithful will save the remaining people "snatching them out of the fire" (Jude 22–23). The referenced scriptural passages are not opposed to the first ones. And again, it is understood that salvation is given from God alone and the faithful are saved solely through the redemptive work of the Lord Jesus. People are instruments of God and co-workers in the work of salvation. By word, prayer, or their life in Christ, they prepare the saints and make them honorable members of the mystical Body of Christ, who is the head and "the savior of the Body" (Eph 5:23), namely, of the Church. Outside of the Church itself, namely, outside of the mystical Body of Christ, there exists no possibility of salvation, according to the well-known patristic teaching. The faithful, as members of the Body and partakers of its charismatic energies, are active and themselves as "Christ-bearers" and "God-bearers" also save in Christ when building up and supporting each other. Since this communion in the mystical Body is not dissolved by death, but all live in Christ, the faithful departed and perfected in Christ continue to also again save us by their words that have been recorded in sacred books, by their example that is put forward for imitation, and above all by their prayers and "active" entreaties to God. For this reason, also, not only does the Church read the sacred teachings of the saints to the faithful and put forward their faith and works for imitation, but also continuously invokes their prayers and supplications. If

these things apply regarding the saints, they apply much more regarding the 'beyond-holy'[1102] Theotokos herself, who alone was deemed worthy to become mother of God and to contribute in this unique manner more directly to the salvation of the world. In precisely this sense, we address ourselves to her, the one always living and vigilant in interceding for all of us, and when invoking her help, we chant "Most holy Theotokos, save us," which is, as we saw, consistent with both the holy Scriptures and the dogmatic teaching of the Church.

Fr. Epiphanios Theodōropoulos, in his article entitled "Must 'Most holy Theotokos, save us' be discarded?" which was published in the periodical *Parish*, vol. 13 (1958), pp. 121–122, comes to precisely the same conclusions: "'Most holy Theotokos, save us' must not at all be rejected, because, while singing and chanting this with the lips and heart, we do not seek from the undefiled Lady that she save us by her own power, authority, and natural right, as some have wrongly assumed, but in order that, making use of her infinite and maternal boldness towards God the Word, to whom she lent her own flesh, she may contribute by her intercessions in such a manner as we finally gain salvation in Christ and be delivered from eternal death. Consequently . . . this does not refer to anything else except her fervent intercessions through which she can contribute to successful progress for our salvation, again, in Christ."[1103] Accordingly, also see the specific book of professor Iōannēs Kalogērou, *Mary the ever-virgin Theotokos according to the Orthodox faith*, Thessaloniki, 1957, and professor

1102. "τὴν ὑπέρ-ἁγία." Phountoulēs is emphasizing the meaning of this word in Greek by showing its constituent parts. In English, "ὑπεραγία," is normally translated as "most holy."

1103. ὁ π. Ἐπιφάνιος Θεοδωρόπουλος, "Πρέπει νὰ ἀποβληθῇ τὸ "Ὑπεραγία Θεοτόκε, σῶσον ἡμᾶς';" *Ἐνορία* 13 (1958): 121–122. Archimandrite Epiphanios Theodōropoulos (1930–1989) was a modern Orthodox ascetic and widely published spiritual author. Among his works were writings opposed to ecumenism. For a brief outline of his life, see Nicholas Palis, *Counsels for Life: From the Life and Teachings of Father Epiphanios* (Thessaloniki: "Orthodox Kypselli" Publications, 2005), 9–12.

Megas Pharantos, "The place and significance of the Theotokos in faith and life," *Theologia,* vol. 44 (1973), pp. 136–156.[1104]

But for these our conclusions not to be considered as arbitrary, it will be necessary for us to make a retrospection into the liturgical texts of our Church in order to reinforce them. Let us begin with the modern Typika. The *Typikon of the Great Church of Christ* (G. Violakēs) in the "Introduction," § 24, provides for the chanting of "Most holy Theotokos, save us," in place of a verse from the biblical odes at the troparia of the Mother of God of the canons.[1105] The same thing also for the canons of the Theotokos, both those of feasts of the Mother of God (September 8, and so forth) and of the Paraklētikē. On the basis of this rubric, "Most holy Theotokos, save us" has also been placed before the troparia of the canon of the Akathist and in the canons of Paraklēsis in the printed editions of the Hōrologion of the Apostolikē Diakonia (Athens 1963, 1967). The same taxis is also observed in the monasteries of the Holy Mountain. We all know how sensitive the monks always were to dogmatic questions.[1106]

But let it not be thought that the introduction of this verse was done during centuries of religious ignorance; it is encountered as a propsalma of the heirmos of the ninth ode of the canon for the Exaltation of the Precious Cross ("O Theotokos, you are a mystical paradise . . .")[1107] in the *Codex Athens 2062,* f. 95, from the fourteenth century. From the oldest liturgical tradition, I at least do not know a witness regarding the use of this verse in the instances above. However, this does not have significance; in

1104. Ἰωάννης Καλογήρου, *Μαρία ἡ ἀειπάρθενος Θεοτόκος κατὰ τὴν ὀρθόδοξον πίστιν* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Τύποις Μ. Τριανταφύλου1957). Μέγας Φαράντος, "Ἡ θέσις καὶ ἡ σημασία τῆς Θεοτόκου εἰς τὴν πίστιν καὶ εἰς τὴν ζωήν," *Θεολογία* 44 (1973): 136–156.

1105. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 22.

1106. As a personal account, one of the translators of this volume when visiting the monastery of Philotheou on Mount Athos in 2005, after questioning one of the monks on chanting the insertion (namely, "Most holy Theotokos, save us") was told that "I would rather be incorrect about this modern insertion, than upset the Theotokos by not inserting it."

1107 "Μυστικὸς εἶ Θεοτόκε . . ."

many troparia we find the same phrase with the same or similar words. We gather a few. The invocation to the Theotokos is encountered in the alphabetical troparia of the Small Hagiasmos that are already found in the manuscripts from the twelfth century, just as it is also in present-day printed editions or in different variations: "You who received the joyful message through an angel and bore the Creator himself, O Virgin, save those who magnify you,"[1108] "Vivify me . . .through your intercessions save me,"[1109] "You who conceived in your womb the Creator of all things, O Virgin wholly without blemish, through your intercessions save our souls,"[1110] "In due fashion . . . that by your intercessions we may be saved,"[1111] "Break asunder . . . and save me,"[1112] "Virgin Theotokos, by your intercessions, save all who for refuge flee unto you . . .,"[1113] or "Save all, O Most Holy . . .,"[1114] or "Save, save . . .,"[1115] "Spare . . . and save us . . .,"[1116] "Chanting to you . . . and save, O all-hymned one."[1117] Similar, but by far perhaps older, is the theotokion of the fifth antiphon of Matins for Great Friday, "In the last times, you ineffably conceived and bore the Creator himself, O Virgin, save those who magnify you."[1118] Likewise, most ancient are also the troparia of the

1108. "Ἡ τὸ χαῖρε δι' ἀγγέλου δεξαμένη, καὶ τεκοῦσα τὸν Κτίστην τὸν ἴδιον, Παρθένε σῷζε τοὺς σὲ μεγαλύνοντας."

1109. "Ζώωσόν με ἡ τεκοῦσα Ζωοδότην καὶ Σωτῆρα· σῶσον ταῖς πρεσβείαις σου, εὐλογημένη, ἐλπὶς τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν."

1110. "Ἡ τὸν Κτίστην τῶν ἁπάντων ἐν γαστρί σου συλλαβοῦσα, Παρθένε πανάμωμε, ταῖς σαῖς πρεσβείαις, σῶσον τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν."

1111. "Κατὰ χρέος ἐκβοῶμέν σοι τό, Χαῖρε, Θεοτόκε, ἁγνὴ ἀειπάρθενε, ἐκδυσωποῦντες πρεσβείαις σου σῴζεσθαι."

1112. "Ῥῆξον . . . καὶ σῶσόν με."

1113. "Σῶσον πάντας ταῖς πρεσβείαις σου, Παρθένε, τοὺς εἰς σέ, Θεοτόκε, προστρέχοντας, καὶ ῥῦσαι πάσης ἀνάγκης καὶ θλίψεως."

1114. "Σῶσον πάντας, Παναγία . . ."

1115. "Σῶσον, σῶσον, Θεοτόκε παναγία, τὴν ψυχήν μου ἐν ὥρᾳ τοῦ τέλους μου καὶ ἐκδημίας τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος."

1116. "Φεῖσαι, φεῖσαι, τοῦ λαοῦ σου, Θεοτόκε, τοὺς πιστῶς σε τιμῶντας, πανάχραντε, καὶ σῶσον ἡμᾶς ἁγία Θεόνυμφε."

1117. "Ψάλλοντές σοι ἐκβοῶμέν σοι, τὸ χαίρε μὴ παρίδης τοὺς δούλους σου, Δέσποινα, ἀλλὰ βοήθησον καὶ σώσον, πανύμνητε."

1118. "Ἡ ἀρρήτως, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων συλλαβοῦσα, καὶ τεκοῦσα, τὸν Κτίστην τὸν ἴδιον, Παρθένε σῷζε, τοὺς σὲ μεγαλύνοντας."

Paraklētikē, which have similar expressions, of which we gather a few: Tone One— "We who are afflicted . . . let us cry out with thanksgiving, save us,"[1119] "The world has been renewed at your conceiving . . . the salvation of the faithful"[1120] (aposticha of Saturday Small Vespers, third and fourth troparia), "O Mary the sacred . . . you have brought forth salvation for sinners and you save your servants"[1121] (Sunday Matins, second kathisma, 3), "The joy of the heavenly orders . . . O undefiled Virgin, save us"[1122] (Sunday Vespers, stichēron theotokion), "More holy than all the holy powers . . . mistress of the world, save us"[1123] (aposticha of Monday Matins). Tone Two— "Contemplating a time of affliction . . . O maiden, I cry out to you . . . and save me"[1124] (stichēron of Monday Vespers). Tone Four— "Incline to the supplications . . . and salvation of our souls"[1125] (aposticha of Sunday Vespers). Grave Tone— "Under your protection, O mistress . . . and save our souls"[1126] (aposticha of Saturday Vespers), "You have excelled the orders of angels . . . hasten to save me"[1127] (aposticha of Sunday Vespers). Plagal of Fourth Tone— "From multitudes of my deeds unlawful and wicked in a sea of dread . . . O Lady Theotokos, in your compassion, yourself save

---

1119. "Οἱ συνεχόμενοι . . . βοῶμεν εὐχαρίστως· σῶσον ἡμᾶς . . ."

1120. "Ἀνεκαινίσθη ὁ κόσμος . . . τῶν πιστῶν ἡ σωτηρία."

1121. "Μαρία τὸ σεπτόν . . . πέφυκας ἁμαρτωλῶν σωτηρία καὶ σῴζεις τοὺς δούλους σου."

1122. "Τῶν οὐρανίων ταγμάτων . . . ἄχραντε παρθένε, σῶσον ἡμᾶς."

1123. "Ἁγιωτέρα ἁγίων . . . δέσποινα τοῦ κοσμοῦ, σῶσον ἡμᾶς."

1124. "Ὥραν τῆς ἑτάσεως . . . κόρη, κράζω σοι . . . καὶ σῶσόν με"

1125. "Νεῦσον παρακλήσεσι, σῶν οἰκετῶν πανάμωμε, παύουσα δεινῶν ἡμῶν ἐπαναστάσεις, πάσης θλίψεως ἡμᾶς ἀπαλλάττουσα· σὲ γὰρ μόνην ἀσφαλῆ, καὶ βεβαίαν ἄγκυραν ἔχομεν, καὶ τὴν σὴν προστασίαν κεκτήμεθα, μὴ αἰσχυνθῶμεν Δέσποινα, σὲ προσκαλούμενοι, σπεῦσον εἰς ἱκεσίαν τῶν σοὶ πιστῶς βοώντων· Χαῖρε Δέσποινα, ἡ πάντων βοήθεια, χαρὰ καὶ σκέπη, καὶ σωτηρία τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν."

1126. "Ὑπὸ τὴν σὴν δέσποινα σκέπην, πάντες οἱ γηγενεῖς προσπεφευγότες βοῶμέν σοι· Θεοτόκε, ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν, ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἐξ ἀμέτρων πταισμάτων, καὶ σῶσον τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν."

1127. "Τάγματα ὑπερέβης Ἀγγέλων, ὡς Θεὸν σωματώσασα· ἐγὼ δὲ τοὺς πάντας νικήσας ἁμαρτίαις· οἴμοι! δέδοικα, καὶ τρέμω· ὅθεν οὐδαμῶς ἀποτολμῶ παρακαλέσαι σε, Θεοτόκε Δέσποινα· σὺ οὖν μὴ παρίδῃς με, ἀλλὰ σπεῦσον σῶσόν με, ὁδὸν εἰς εὐθεῖαν ὁδηγοῦσά με."

me"[1128] (second kathisma, 3, of Tuesday Matins). And a few from the feasts of the Mother of God— "After you were born . . . save our race"[1129] (stichēra of Great Vespers for November 21), "When you departed . . . save our souls"[1130] (apostícha for August 15), "Accept from us . . . grant victory to the emperor, peace to the Christ-loving people, forgiveness to those who sing, and salvation of souls"[1131] (canon of Saint Iōannēs of Damascus, ninth ode, third troparion for August 15), "O Maiden, the divine prophetic choir . . .rejoice, only salvation of humanity"[1132] (canon, seventh ode, second troparion for March 24). And finally, the very well-known troparion, "Open unto us the gate of compassion . . . for you are the salvation of the race of Christians."[1133]

However, the argument is usually made to us that in the hymnography of our Church, hymns contain expressions not dogmatically precise, because they are poetic works that are not composed to formulate the doctrines, but to praise sacred persons "with poetic license," with the hyperboles customary also in "secular"[1134] poetry and the flowers of rhetoric. However, this subject is debatable; the sacred hymnographers were at the same time also theologians and had an awareness of the precision of dogma and of the strictly liturgical character of their compositions. The Church, also, when hymning God and praising its saints, theologizes in an Orthodox manner, expresses dogma through its worship, and, by this, teaches its people the correct faith. But even if we accept this view as correct for the moment, and accept "Most holy Theotokos, save us" as a hymn, it could, just as the parallel expressions in hymns that we have just collected above, also be judged by the same measure, namely,

---

1128. "Εἰς πέλαγος δεινῆς, ἐμπεσὼν ἀθυμίας, ἐκ πλήθους πονηρῶν, καὶ ἀθέσμων μου ἔργων . . . Δέσποινα Θεοτόκε, αὐτή με σῶσον τῇ εὐσπλαγχνίᾳ σου . . ."

1129. "Μετὰ τὸ τεχθῆναί σε . . . σῷζε τὸ γένος ἡμῶν."

1130. "Ὅτε ἐξεδήμησας . . . σῶσον τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν."

1131. "Δέχου παρ' ἡμῶν . . . καὶ ψυχῶν σωτηρίαν βραβεύουσα"

1132. "Προφητικὸς θεῖος χορός . . . χαῖρε μόνη τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡ σωτηρία."

1133. "Τῆς εὐσπλανγχνίας τὴν πύλην . . . σὺ γὰρ εἶ ἡ σωτηρία τοῦ γένους τῶν χριστιανῶν."

1134. "θύραθεν." This word can also mean "outside Christianity, pagan" in its patristic sense, see Lampe, s.v. "θύραθεν."

inasmuch as the phrase, "save us" regarding the Theotokos would be tolerated in other hymns, according to the same logic it would also be tolerated in, "Most holy Theotokos, save us," even as a hyperbole or an apostrophe that is also done with "poetic license."

However, the fact that this clearly concerns an Orthodox formulation we can also see from analogous expressions in other non-poetic patristic works. Here are a few: "the workshop of our salvation" (Iōannēs of Damascus, *Encomium on the all-venerable Dormition of the Mother of God*, 3, 5),[1135] "Rejoice . . . the common salvation of all the ends of the earth together" (ibid., *Oration on the Annunciation*),[1136] "Through her [the Theotokos], first and alone, we have been saved" (Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Explanation*, 50),[1137] "For through her they are illumined and from her first we are saved through the saints, for we have also been united to God through her . . . salvation is the same for the whole world . . . also through her do we have hope of salvation . . . as being able above all to save us" (Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Dialogue*, chapters 94, 99, and 359).[1138]

From all the above, I think it was made absolutely clear and there is no room for any dispute or contention that the verse, "Most holy Theotokos, save us," is correct in its dogmatic formulation and correctly said in divine worship wherever it is provided for to be said.

2. The first part of the question concerns the insertion of "Most holy Theotokos, save us" in the synaptes, when her name, with the adorning epithets that accompany it, is said by the deacon or, in his absence, by the priest. This insertion is not encountered in any manuscript or printed edition. This shows that it is a later custom

1135. "τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν τὸ ἐργαστήριον." B. Kotter, ed. and trans., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskus* Patristische Texte und Studien 29 (De Gruyter: Berlin, 1988), 5:554. See the translation of Brian Daley, *On the Dormition of the Mary: Early Patristic Homilies* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1998), 237.

1136. PG 96:660a.

1137. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 113.

1138. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 221, 253, PG 155:669b.

not justified by our liturgical tradition. Why is it said? This is easily explainable. Piety toward the Theotokos was and is great among our people; and quite rightly. At the hearing of her name, the faithful made the sign of the cross and said to themselves the customary brief invocation to her from other liturgical instances. Thus, the insertion of the megalynarion also began in the Divine Liturgy during the mention of her name at the beginning of the diptychs, after the consecration of the precious gifts, which also eventually became prevalent. We have a parallel also at, "Save, O God, your people . . .,"[1139] in Matins, where, both for the Theotokos and other saints, analogous invocations are inserted by many chanters. Both in the latter case, and at the conclusions of synaptes, it is not correct for this exclamation to take place. At least it is not justified by tradition and by correct liturgical taxis. Besides, it interrupts the phrase of the diaconal exhortation to the people with a pointless insertion, thus overshadowing its whole meaning and transferring its weight from Christ and the commending of our life to him, to the intercessions of the Theotokos.

286

During the reading of the Apostolos, the service books say that the priest censes. Some priests do not cense. What is correct for us to do, for us to cense or not?

According to the modern printed editions of our liturgical books, "while the reader is reciting . . . the pericope of the epistle reading, the deacon taking the censer censes around the holy table, the icons of Christ, the Theotokos, the Forerunner, and the temple on the iconostasis,[1140] and the people from the beautiful gate . . ." (Hieratikon, edition of the Apostolikē Diakonia, 1968, p. 80). In this standard rubric, the modern practice that is commonly observed nowadays in our Church is crystalized. In the older printed Euchologia or Hi-

1139. "Σῶσον ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαόν σου . . ."

1140. "τὰς δεσποτικὰς εἰκόνας." See *Dictionary of Standard Modern Greek*, s.v. "δεσποτικός²," https://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/modern_greek/tools/lexica/triantafyllides/search.html?page=23&lq=δε, accessed August 24, 2022.

eratika, this censing either is not mentioned or, if mentioned, features a small but important variation: the censing is restricted only to the bēma and does not extend, as is in the rubric above, to the icons of the templon and to the people. Accordingly, the deacon censes "around the holy table and the whole sanctuary and the priest" (Great Euchologion, Venice 1760, and others). The omission of the censing of the icons and of the people is not by chance, nor is it omitted as self-evident. Our liturgical practice at this point experienced a modern development, namely, the extension of the censing from the sacred bēma outwards. According to all the later manuscripts and the *Diataxis* of Philotheos, the deacon censes only the holy table "around in a crosswise manner and the whole sanctuary and the priest"[1141] (*Codices Athens 765, 767, 802, Moscow 381, Diataxis* of the *Codex Athens 662, Diataxis* of Philotheos of the *Codex Panteleēmonos 6277-770*). According to the older manuscripts, the censing appears even more plain and is limited to the censing of only the holy table (*Vatican 1554*) and originally it appears that the Gospel book alone was censed, which was laid on the holy table, as about the same is done with the censing of the precious gifts after the great entrance, the consecration, and holy communion. And this is because the offering of incense is not connected to the reading of the epistle, but to the liturgical practices that precede the reading of the gospel pericope, such as the chanting of "Alleluia," the prayer before the gospel reading, the blessing of "the proclaimer of the gospel"[1142]/ deacon, and the censing, for which they are the reason.

A censing before the gospel reading is also encountered in all liturgical forms, with special prayers of blessing of the incense, such as in the Liturgies of the West and the ancient Liturgies of the East, the Jerusalemite Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, the Alexandrian Liturgy of Saint Markos, and the Armenian Liturgy. In other words, this is about a pan-Christian liturgical practice, which is done in honor of the holy gospel reading, for the sanctification and illumination of the faithful, and symbolic of the fra-

1141. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 7.
1142. "εὐαγγελιστοῦ."

grance of the Holy Spirit distributed by the words of the gospel. The prayers of incense and the commentators of the Divine Liturgy emphasize this meaning of the offering of incense before the gospel reading. We gather the most characteristic phrases: "To you, O Lord our God, who are filled with all fragrance and gladness which you have given us, we offer this incense. Let it rise before you, we pray, from our lowly hands to your holy and heavenly altar, as a sweet fragrance for the remission of our sins and the forgiveness of your people" (Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos).[1143] "Incense do we offer before your holy glory, O God, which receiving at your holy and celestial and spiritual altar, send down in return to us the grace of your Holy Spirit" (Liturgy of Markos. Similar prayers are encountered in the Byzantine Liturgies in many manuscripts).[1144] "Before the gospel reading there is incense on account of the grace of the Spirit being given by the Gospel to the whole world" (Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Explanation*, 68).[1145] "The censer . . .which moving with the incense represents the grace of the Holy Spirit" (Sōphronios of Jerusalem, *Oration containing all ecclesiastical history and a detailed narration of all performed in the Divine Sacred-Service*, 18. Theodōros of Andida, *Summary Commentary concerning the symbols and mysteries*, 17).[1146]

1143. "Σοὶ τῷ πεπληρωμένῳ πάσης εὐωδίας, καὶ εὐφροσύνης, Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἐξ ὧν δέδωκας ἡμῖν, προσφέρομέν σοι τὸ θυμίαμα τοῦτο· ἀναληφθήτω δὴ δεόμεθα ἐνώπιόν σου ἐκ πενιχρῶν ἡμῶν χειρῶν εἰς τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ὑπερουράνιόν σου Θυσιαστήριον, εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν καὶ εἰς ἱλασμὸν τοῦ λαοῦ σου." B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 54–55. Translation taken from, *The Divine Liturgy of Saint James (Iakovos), Brother of the Lord* (Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 1988), 9.

1144. "Θυμίαμα προσφέρομεν ἐνώπιον τῆς ἁγίας δόξης σου, ὁ Θεός, ὃ προσδεξάμενος εἰς τὸ ἅγιον καὶ ὑπερουράνιον καὶ νοερόν σου θυσιαστήριον, ἀντικατάπεμψον ἡμῖν τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος." See the discussion in *The Liturgy of Saint Mark*, ed. Geoffrey J. Cuming, OCA 234 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990), 82–85.

1145. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 121.

1146. The passage is almost identical in both works. Sōphronios of Jerusalem: "Ὁ δὲ θυμιατός, [ὁ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τοῦ Ἀλληλούϊα] μετὰ θυμιάματος κινούμενος τὴν χάριν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος δηλοῖ," (PG 87:3997c). Theodōros

Our insistence on the citation of all these testimonies that concern the history and significance of the censing before the gospel reading perhaps appears as scholastic and essentially irrelevant to the question. But our intention is precisely this: to derive the unforced conclusion that both the tradition and the meaning of this practice, as they are authentically formulated by the testimonies of our liturgical texts, and by universal practice and by the sacred interpreters of our divine worship, do not encourage us to superficially address this detailed—so be it—subject. In other words, the omission of the offering of incense before the gospel reading is clearly contrary to the letter and the spirit of the liturgical tradition and for this reason is to be condemned.

However, the priests who omit the censing cite two very serious reasons: first, that it prevents the hearing of the epistle reading, even if it is done as noiselessly as possible, and second, that it creates disorder in the congregation, since the faithful barely having sat are also standing again in order to bow their heads, according to the custom, when they are censed, and once more sit again. And this second reason is noteworthy, but the first is liturgically and logically unacceptable. The text of the epistle reading has quite a few linguistic and theological difficulties and its reading is not always adequate. Our effort, as we also previously wrote, must aim to assist the congregation in its understanding and not to distract its attention with pointless movements either of the celebrants or of the people. But in addition, the priest is not an element alien to the synaxis, but the head of the synaxis. The readings are not read only for the people, but also for the priest; and he himself must hear the reading and especially set a good example to the faithful of attentive listening and not leave the impression that this is something negligible, inasmuch as at the time of the reading he is involved with the censing. And something even more human; the time of the reading of the Apostolos

---

of Andida: "Ὁ δὲ θυμιατός, [ὁ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τοῦ Ἀλληλούϊα] μετὰ θυμιάματος κινούμενος τὴν χάριν δηλοῖ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος," (PG 140:440d). The bracketed portions are omitted in the text of Phountoulēs.

gives perhaps the only opportunity for the priest, especially when he is not concelebrating with a deacon, to rest for a few minutes. During the reading of the Apostolos, the priests and people were always seated.

However, the way of treating this disorder, namely, the omission of the censing, is reminiscent of a primitive medical treatment. A way must be found to correct the evil, but not by way of another evil. The liturgical tradition of the Church also again gives us the best solution. According to all the old manuscripts, the old printed Euchologia, the *Diataxis* of Philotheos, the sacred commentators, and the rubrics of the ancient Liturgies, the censing did not take place during the epistle reading but during the allēlouarion. "Alleluia" was chanted not only three times, but no less than nine times (three times, thrice). Our liturgical books preserve after the epistle reading two customary verses from a single psalm every time, especially selected, as well as the prokeimenon, in connection with the theme of the day. The first triple "Alleluia" was chanted without a verse in the tone of the Sunday or in the tone that is specified every time in the Apostolos before the verses of the allēlouarion. The psalm was obviously called an "allēlouarion" because the manuscripts distinguish between "Alleluia" and an allēlouarion. The psalm was originally chanted in entirety or in part, inasmuch as it would cover the liturgical actions that were provided for to be done during it. Chanting of such a type was preserved in the Liturgy for the Vespers of Pascha (Great Saturday), but where, instead of "Alleluia," a resurrectional verse of the same psalm (Psalm 81, verse 8, "Arise, O God . . ."[1147]) is repeated. In this same manner, the psalm of the allēlouarion was intoned by the reader and at every verse the triple "Alleluia" was chanted as an ephymnion. In the *Diataxis* of Philotheos and in the manuscripts, diaconal exhortations precede, analogous to those of the prokeimenon ("The deacon, 'Wisdom' or 'Wisdom, let us attend.' The chanter, 'Alleluia. Psalm of David.' The deacon, 'Let us

1147. "Ἀνάστα, ὁ Θεός ion"

attend,' and the allēlouarion is chanted."[1148] *Codices Panteleēmonos 6277-770, Barberini 393, 431, Vatican 573, 1811, 1973, 2005, Sinai 1020, Hagiou Saba 362*, among others). The allēlouarion is the prokeimenon of the gospel reading. A chanting of "Alleluia" with verses was preserved in the Melkite churches of the East, and a censing during the "Alleluia" (long)[1149] in the festive Liturgies on the Holy Mountain. The corruption of this point in the Divine Liturgy began with the originally optional transfer of the censing or with its beginning during the reading of the epistle, which is testified to in manuscripts, especially from the fourteenth century, with the result that the chanting of the allēlouarion was gradually limited to the now well-known triple "Alleluia" ("While the epistle reading is still being said, the deacon censes . . ." *Codex Hagiou Saba 362*). Nevertheless, the standard rubrics of the oldest printed editions are faithful to the older correct practice and provide for the censing, not during the epistle reading, but during the allēlouarion: "While the 'Alleluia' is being chanted, the deacon taking the censer and incense approaches the priest and receiving a blessing from him censes the holy table . . ." (Great Euchologion, editions of Venice, 1760, 1832, 1862; The Divine Liturgies, editions of Venice, 1881, Athens, 1865, and others).

During the chanting of the "Alleluia," all the preparatory elements for the reading of the Gospel book were done: the offering of the incense, the reading of the prayer before the gospel reading, the blessing of the proclaimer of the gospel/deacon, and his transition to the ambōn. Thus, all the rites that prepare for the gospel reading are found in their liturgically correct place, namely, before the gospel reading and not during the reading of the Apostolos. In this manner, the well-ordered recitation of the epistle reading was ensured, since the priest and the people listened to it undisturbed, and the censing and the transition of the deacon to the ambōn, which distract the attention of the faithful, did not take place, as well as the reading of the prayer of the gospel and the blessing of the deacon, which

1148. Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 7.

1149. Chanting books provide melodies that are "short, longer, and long" (σύντομα, ἀργοσύντομα, καὶ ἀργά) for various troparia.

together with the other two actions occupy the priest during the epistle reading nowadays.

It is certainly true that the restoration of the chanting of the allēlouarion would cause some lengthening for the time duration of the Divine Liturgy, especially in an era in which all are in a hurry and all speak about the shortening and not the lengthening of the services. However, so much is the benefit that would result from the restoration of the allēlouarion, that we must not take into account this small delay, which moreover could easily be made up for by a simpler recitation of the exclamations or by simpler chanting. The chanting of the allēlouarion has been tested; it scarcely lasts one or two minutes if the censing is not prolonged.

287

What must the priest say when after the reading of the Apostolos he blesses the reader: "Εἰρήνη σοι τῷ ἀναγινώσκοντι"[1150] (Peace be to you the one who reads), "Εἰρήνη σοι τῷ ἀναγνόντι"[1151] (Peace be to you who read), "Εἰρήνη σοι τῷ ἀναγνώσαντι"[1152] (Peace be to you who read), or "Εἰρήνη σοι τῷ ἀναγινώσκοντι καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ" (Peace be to you the one who reads and to all the people)?

Indeed, on this point, a great lack of uniformity is observed. It is possible for one to hear both the four forms above and, more rarely also the simple, "Εἰρήνη σοι." (Peace be to you). Another form is also encountered in some manuscripts, "Σωθείης" (May you be saved) (*Codices Hagiou Saba 362, Athens 754,* and others). The same disorder is also observed in the blessing of "the proclaimer of the gospel"[1153]/deacon, but it is not as obvious, because the celebration of the Divine Liturgy with the participation of a deacon is not as common, at least nowadays. But here, we hear, "Εἰρήνη σοι" (Peace be to you),

1150. Singular present active masculine dative participle of ἀναγιγνώσκω.
1151. Singular aorist[2] active masculine dative participle of ἀναγιγνώσκω.
1152. Singular aorist[1] active masculine dative participle of ἀναγιγνώσκω.
1153. "εὐαγγελιστοῦ."

"Εἰρήνη σοι τῷ εὐαγγελιζομένῳ"[1154] (Peace be to you the one who proclaims the gospel), and "Εἰρήνη σοι τῷ εὐαγγελισαμένῳ"[1155] (Peace be to you the one who proclaimed the gospel), with or without the addition, "καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ" (and to all the people); in addition, we have "Σωθείης" (May you be saved) of the manuscripts. We will take the opportunity to examine both together because this is essentially about one and the same issue.

From the ancient period, we have no witness whether a blessing was given to the readers or to the deacon after the reading of the pericopes. However, it is possible that almost from the beginning the bishop or priest blessed the readers "in recompense for the work" (Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Dialogue*, chapter 98).[1156] In many manuscripts, mention is made regarding this blessing without the form of the phrase that accompanied it being referenced. The standard rubric simply prescribes that the celebrant blesses the reader or the deacon. The usual form of the blessing is, "Εἰρήνη σοι" (Peace be to you). We encounter precisely this form in all the manuscripts from the twelfth century onwards after the reading of the epistle and after the reading of the gospel, or in only one of these two cases (*Codices Sinai 1020, 986,* and many others), just as also in the *Diataxis* of the patriarch Philotheos. Symeōn of Thessaloniki also implies this form of the blessing, either when using the technical term, "εἰρηνεύειν τὴν ἐπιστολήν" (to greet the epistle with peace), or when analyzing the meaning of the blessing, "He gives the reader peace and a blessing before and after [the reading] . . . in recompense for the work, just as earlier he provides the one who read the apostle's words with peace and a blessing" (*Dialogue*, chapter 98).[1157] The oldest printed editions of the Euchologia and Hieratika follow this tradition. Namely,

1154. Singular present middle–passive masculine dative participle of εὐαγγελίζομαι.

1155. Singular aorist middle–passive masculine dative participle of εὐαγγελίζομαι.

1156. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 247.

1157. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 247.

when they mention a form of blessing, they use, "Εἰρήνη σοι" (Peace be to you), just as also the manuscripts.

The lengthier form, "Εἰρήνη σοι τῷ εὐαγγελιζομένῳ"[1158] (Peace be to you the one who proclaims the gospel), is encountered for the first time, as far as I know, in a manuscript from the sixteenth century of the National Library of Athens (under number 749), as well as in several relatively modern printed editions of the Euchologia of Venice of 1832, 1862, and 1881. Both in the manuscripts and in the printed editions above, the ancient form of blessing, "Εἰρήνη σοι" (Peace be to you), is provided for the blessing of the reader of the epistle. Therefore, it is clear that the development of the expression for blessing began in this manner. It is obvious from where it came. The deacon, when about to read the gospel, received a blessing that already from the twelfth century began to be accompanied with the twelfth verse of Psalm 67, "Κύριος δώσει ρῆμα τοῖς εὐαγγελιζομένοις δυνάμει πολλῇ" (The Lord will give speech to those who proclaim the good news with great power) (see both Isa 52:7/Rom 10:15 and Isa 40:9) and finally took the well-known form, "Ὁ Θεὸς διὰ πρεσβειῶν . . .δώῃ σοι ρῆμα τῷ εὐαγγελιζομένῳ δυνάμει πολλῇ εἰς ἐκπλήρωσιν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου . . ." (May God through the intercessions . . . grant speech to proclaim the gospel with great power to you unto the fulfillment of the gospel . . .). From the preparatory blessing of the "εὐαγγελιζομένου" (one who proclaims the gospel), it was easy for the word[1159] to also migrate to the blessing after the end of the reading. The blessing for the reader of the epistle remained in its original simple form, perhaps in order for the preeminence of the reading of the gospel to be stressed compared to the epistle, a tendency which we also saw in another context. However, it did not take long, obviously due to reasons of parallelism and uniformity, for the blessing of the one who proclaims the gospel to influence the blessing for the reader. Thus, in the modern printed editions,

1158. Singular present middle–passive masculine dative participle of εὐαγγελίζομαι.

1159. The word is "τοῦ εὐαγγελιζομένου" (the one who proclaims the gospel).

both forms are similar: the first became, "Εἰρήνη σοι τῷ ἀναγινώσκοντι" (Peace be to you the one who reads) (Great Euchologion, edition of N. Papadopoulos–M. Saliveros, Athens, 1927. Hieratikon, edition of N. Papadopoulos, Athens, n.d. Hieratikon, edition of Rome, 1950. Hieratikon, editions of the Apostolikē Diakonia, 1951, 1962. Archieratikon, edition of the Apostolikē Diakonia, 1961, and others). Moreover, the word, "ἀναγινώσκων"[1160] (one who reads), is also biblical (Matt 24:15, Rev 1:3).[1161]

The blessing of the reader, as most commonly used, was also more susceptible to development and thus—consistent with the tendency for expansion that we have also encountered when we mentioned it regarding the dismissals—received the addition, "καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ" (and to all the people) that we frequently hear, but rarely encounter in the printed editions, which basically remained faithful to the preceding stage of development. However, we find it in the edition of the Hieratikon (The Divine Liturgy . . .) of G. Karyophyllēs, Athens 1892, pp. 38 and 66.

A philological problem afterwards arose for those more scholarly. Since the reading of the epistle or the gospel has already been done, it is not grammatically correct to use the form, "ἀναγινώσκοντι." (one who reads), or "εὐαγγελιζομένῳ" (one who proclaims the gospel). The correct grammatical form ought to be "ἀναγνόντι" (one who read) or "εὐαγγελισαμένῳ" (one who proclaimed the gospel). Archbishop Chrysostomos (of Philippi and Neapolis) of blessed memory, in his *Hierotelestikon*, Athens 1948, brings about this correction only to the blessing of the reader, ("Εἰρήνη σοι τῷ ἀναγνόντι," Peace be to you who read, pp. 117 and 167), but preserves "εὐαγγελιζομένῳ" (one who proclaims the gospel) in the case of the deacon (pp. 118 and 169).[1162] This is corrected by some, without having yet been introduced into any more recent edition.[1163]

1160. Singular present active masculine nominative participle of ἀναγινώσκω.

1161. The reference Acts 8:30 can also be added.

1162. Χρυσόστομος Φιλίππων καὶ Νεαπόλεως, *Ἱεροτελεστικόν* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1948), 117, 167, 118, 169.

1163. Since the time of this writing, the simple form "Εἰρήνη σοι" (Peace be to you) was adopted in the latest editions of the Hieratikon of the Apostolikē

Let us examine each one of these forms of blessing separately: the longer form with the addition, "καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ" (and to all the people), is certainly unfortunate. The blessing concerns only the reader and relates to the completion of his work. The people do not have a place in our case. Moreover, this form is the one least attested to, or rather, it is the one almost without any support in the tradition.

The scholarly forms, "ἀναγνόντι" (one who read) or "εὐαγγελισαμένῳ" (one who proclaimed the gospel), also themselves are unfounded in the tradition. Besides, both are so archaic that they obscure the meaning still more and add to the psychological distancing of the people from divine worship.

The two intermediate forms, "Εἰρήνη σοι τῷ ἀναγινώσκοντι" (Peace be to you the one who reads) and "Εἰρήνη σοι τῷ εὐαγγελιζομένῳ" (Peace be to you the one who proclaims the gospel) have some history. They are relatively old and are resting on a biblical foundation. They can be understood grammatically as referring to those who regularly and repeatedly perform the work of reading or proclaiming the gospel in the temple, namely, the reader and the deacon.

The simple and Doric forms, "Εἰρήνη σοι" (Peace be to you), are without doubt the most preferable. They both have a solemn decent simplicity and are excellently attested to by our liturgical tradition, in manuscript and printed edition.

288

In the synaptes, when the deacon (or the priest) says "Help us, save us, have mercy on us, and protect us, O God, by your grace,"[1164] what is more correct for the chanter to say, "Lord, have mercy" or "Amen"?

The manuscripts and the old printed liturgical books do not prescribe what specifically the response of the people will be to this diaconal petition. Nor from the Fathers nor from the ancient commentators

Diakonia (2019) and of the Ecumenical Patriarchate (2020).

1164. "Ἀντιλαβοῦ, σῶσον, ἐλέησον καὶ διαφύλαξον ἡμᾶς, ὁ Θεός, τῇ σῇ χάριτι."

on the Divine Liturgy can any direct or even indirect reference to the ancient practice in question be detected. However, from certain indications we can come to the conclusion that the correct response is "Lord, have mercy" and not "Amen."

Firstly, it is expressly stated in the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions* that at every diaconal petition the people replied with, "Lord, have mercy": "At each of these that the deacon utters . . . let the people say, 'Lord, have mercy' and above all, the children" (Book 8.6).[1165] And the petition in question certainly does not exist in the series of petitions under precisely the present form, but we repeatedly encounter the similar form, "Save and raise us up, O God, by your mercy"[1166] or "in your power"[1167] or "by your grace."[1168] Indeed, in one of these instances, immediately before this petition there is the diaconal exhortation, "Again, let us all fervently say on their behalf, 'Lord, have mercy.'"[1169] Again in the ancient Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos the Brother of God, at the beginning of the "catholic synaptē," which is found before the prayer of the anaphora, immediately after its introduction with, "In peace, let us pray to the Lord,"[1170] and "the people, 'Lord, have mercy,'" the petition comes, "Save, have mercy, have compassion, and keep us, O God, by your grace."[1171] It is obvious that the indication, "the people, 'Lord, have mercy,'" does not refer only to the initial opening, but also to all the entreaties that follow and all the more so, to the first of them.

Something analogous is observed both in the manuscripts of the Byzantine Liturgies and in the old, printed editions. Immediately

---

1165. *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.6.9 in *Les Constitutions Apostoliques*, ed. and trans. Marcel Metzger, SC 336 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1987), 154–155.

1166. "Σῶσον καὶ ἀνάστησον ἡμᾶς, ὁ Θεός, τῷ ἐλέει σου," *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.10.21 (SC 336:172–173).

1167. "ἐν τῇ δυνάμει σου."

1168. "τῇ σῇ χάριτι."

1169. "'Ετι ἐκτενῶς πάντες ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν εἴπωμεν 'Κύριε, ἐλέησον,'" *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.9.6 (SC 336:164–165).

1170. "Ἐν εἰρήνῃ τοῦ Κυρίου δεηθῶμεν."

1171. "Σῶσον, ἐλέησον, οἰκτίρησον καὶ διαφύλαξον ἡμᾶς, ὁ Θέος, τῇ σῇ χάριτι." B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 72.

after "In peace, let us pray to the Lord" they note, "the people, 'Lord, have mercy.'" The most recent printed editions prescribe that it is said "at each entreaty" or "after each" or "after every entreaty" or "petition." "Help us, save us . . . by your grace" is certainly found here towards the end, but this cannot have great importance, since immediately for the petition following, "Commemorating our most holy, pure... let us commend,"[1172] "To you, O Lord"[1173] is prescribed as a response. Therefore, this also means that in all the previous ones, including even the last one, the response originally indicated ought to apply, namely, "Lord, have mercy." "Amen," is only reserved for the end of the exclamation of the priestly prayer. According to the commentator, "all the faithful say 'Amen' and, when crying aloud this word, they make their own all the utterances of the latter one" (Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 15.2).[1174] Symeōn of Thessaloniki, in his commentary on the great synaptē (*Dialogue*, chapter 332), when referring to the answers of the people to its individual petitions, at "Commemorating our most holy, pure... let us commend," provides for "To you, O Lord," but for all the preceding ones, "Lord, have mercy" ("Wherefore also at the other ones, those present cry aloud only 'Lord, have mercy,' when invoking the divine mercy, while here they say, 'To you, O Lord,' namely, we commend ourselves to you, O Christ God").[1175]

I do not know where Fr. Gervasios Paraskevopoulos of blessed memory based himself in his book, *An Interpretative Overview on the Divine Liturgy*, Patras 1958, pp. 74 and 82,[1176] when at this point of the Divine Liturgy, he provides for "Amen," as a response of the people, which is, according to him, "the most moving confirmation and confession of faith toward divine grace and hope" (p. 74, note 1). On the other hand, very correctly, Archbishop Chrysostomos (of Philippi and Neapolis) of blessed memory, in the *Hierotelestikon*,

1172. "Τῆς παναγίας ἀχράντου... παραθώμεθα."

1173. "Σοί, Κύριε."

1174. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 15.2 (SC 4bis:124–125). The "latter one" (ἐκείνου) refers to the priest and his prayers.

1175. PG 155:604c–604d.

1176. Γερβάσιος Χαρ. Παρασκευόπουλος, *Ἑρμηνευτικὴ ἐπισκόπησις ἐπὶ τῆς θείας λειτουργίας* (Πάτραι: n.p., 1958), 74, 82.

Athens 1948, pp. 34, 39, 74, 110, 111ff., always puts into the mouth of the choir "Lord, have mercy" after "by your grace."[1177] The edition of the Great Euchologion of Rome agrees with him (1873), pp. 16, 43, 44, 45ff., as well as the current precise practice of the Holy Mountain.

289

During the evening of Great Tuesday when the troparion of Kassianē is chanted, must the lights of the temple be extinguished and the faithful light and hold tapers?

The troparion of Kassianē, "O Lord, the woman who had fallen into many sins . . .,"[1178] undoubtedly is a very beautiful troparion. The great teachers of our ecclesiastical music emphasized it with great care and success. It is very beloved among our people both for its masterful content and for its beautiful musical execution. It is well known that many come to church on Great Tuesday evening specifically in order to hear this troparion. However, to be very truthful we must admit that the homonymous popular tale, which in the past was widespread among our people and circulated in many publications in different variations, contributed to the troparion of Kassianē in becoming so beloved. Many are moved by the troparion because it reminds them of the related fictional account of the visit of Theophilos and the flight of Kassianē.[1179]

Liturgically, this troparion is nothing more than a doxastikon of aposticha of Matins. As in all doxastika similar to it, neither the extinguishing of lights nor the lighting of tapers is provided for by

---

1177. Χρυσόστομος Φιλίππων καὶ Νεαπόλεως, *Ἱεροτελεστικόν* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1948), 34, 39, 74, 110, 111ff.

1178. "Κύριε, ἡ ἐν πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις περιπεσοῦσα γυνή . . ."

1179. According to this romantic legend, the iconoclastic emperor Theophilos (829–842) was said to have unsuccessfully pursued Kassianē after initially rejecting her at a bride show and afterwards attempting to visit at her monastery. For a survey of the sources and legends of the romance associated with Kassianē, see Φωτεινὴ Βλαχοπούλου, "Βιβλιογραφικὸ δοκίμιο γιὰ τὴν Κασ[σ]ία–Κασ[σ]ιανή," *Βυζαντινὸς Δόμος* 1 (1987): 139–159. For an example of a popular novel based on such romantic themes, see Φωκίων Ἀ. Φωτόπουλος, *Ἡ Κασσιανή* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἀντώνιος Σαραβάνος, n.d.).

the ecclesiastical taxis. Let us not compromise divine worship with our frivolous actions. The transformation of the sacred temple into a popular theatre hall is impermissible.

290

During the great entrance, does the priest commemorate from the beautiful gate facing the people or in the middle of the temple facing the east?

291

During the great entrance, when we have a memorial service, does the priest commemorate before the tray of kolyba?

292

When a concelebration takes place, does the archimandrite alone commemorate or all the concelebrating priests during the great entrance?[1180]

The topic of the commemoration during the great entrance has been put before us many times. In the answers to questions 10, 11, 70, 230, and 236, we have already made mention of the customary commemoration of certain general categories of faithful or, even in particular, the names of the living and the dead, of those celebrating the Artoklasia, private Liturgy, or memorial service, and so forth.[1181]

1180. This reflects an unfortunate tendency in the Church of Greece and elsewhere for some celibate priests, such as archimandrites, to consider themselves superior by nature to those married, especially in matters of rank during the celebration of services. Theologically, this attitude contradicts Church teaching and appears reminiscent of certain exaggerations. In the case of married priests visiting a monastery, the Typicon of the monastery itself might provide privileges in the order of celebration. However, the question here appears to refer to parish practice.

1181. In the Church of Greece, so-called "private Liturgies" are celebrated in small chapels on private lands or those belonging to parishes and monasteries. These Liturgies are celebrated on the basis of *ad hoc* requests from the faithful, often out of affinity or spiritual obligation to the saint for whom the chapel is dedicated. Although these *ad hoc* Liturgies are technically open to others, they are not part of the official parish calendar nor even made known to other congregants. The phrase "we opened the church" (ἀνοίξαμε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν) is

We return in connection with the questions above for a more thorough examination of the subject, while also recalling what we had noted in the answers above.

The entrance of the precious gifts originally took place in silence, just as we find it in the most ancient Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. When the great entrance gradually developed and expanded into a majestic procession, the chanting of a psalm and later the Cherubic hymn, or another troparion instead of it, was introduced in order that the time for the course of the procession through the middle of the temple might be covered. The deacon and the priest who took part in the procession did not say anything, just as nowadays in the Presanctified and in the ancient Liturgies of Saint Iakōvos and of Saint Markos. Later, "they prayed by themselves"[1182] on behalf of the people or said verses of psalms or troparia. Finally, it became prevalent for the Cherubic hymn to be interrupted and for them to pray "in a loud voice"[1183] on behalf of the people, through the midst of whom they passed "when entering."[1184] This is attested to in manuscripts from the twelfth century onward. The form of the prayer also had already become crystallized, "May the Lord God remember all of you in his kingdom . . .,"[1185] which was said repeatedly and in different variants by the deacon and the priest during the course of the procession. A specification of this general prayer was done when the abbot was present in the monasteries, "τῆς ἱερωσύνης σου . . ." (your priesthood . . .) or also other priests, "τῆς ἱερωσύνης ὑμῶν . . ." (your priesthood . . .), and especially when there was a hierarchical Liturgy, "τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης σου . . ." (your archpriesthood . . .). Up to this point, the tradition of the later manuscripts and of the printed editions is consistent. Similarly, Symeōn of Thessaloniki attests that the deacon and the priests "having gone around

---

an expression often heard in villages after a family has arranged and provided for the celebration of such a Liturgy, especially in the case of chapels not normally used.

1182. "ηὔχοντο καθ᾽ ἑαυτούς."

1183. "μεγαλοφώνως."

1184. "εἰσοδεύοντες."

1185. "Πάντων ὑμῶν μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ . . ."

the temple and having prayed for the people enter the sanctuary, as all pray for the hierarch, since no other prayer but for the kingdom of God is called to mind" (*Explanation,* chapter 77).[1186]

The expansion of the commemoration began, apparently, from the hierarchical Liturgy. The hierarch did not enter, but rather received the holy gifts at the beautiful gate and placed them on the altar. The manuscripts do not attest to whether the hierarch said anything. However, it is very likely that he would reciprocate the sacred courtesy of the deacon and of the priest and perhaps also repeated the general prayer to the people, "Πάντων ὑμων . . ." (May the Lord God remember all of you . . .). It would not be difficult in this commemoration for the patriarch, the synod, the emperors, and gradually also other categories of faithful, or living or dead by name, to be added. For there to be some correspondence, the commemoration of the living during the reception of the paten was separated from the commemoration of the dead during the reception of the holy chalice. This taxis is described in the standard rubrics of the hierarchical Liturgy, "he receives it [the holy paten] in his hands and commemorates the living . . . and he receives [the holy chalice] from his hands [of the priest] and . . . commemorates the dead" (*Hierotelestikon* of Chrysostomos of Philippi and Neapolis, Athens 1948, p. 257).[1187] In the Archieratikon, the commemoration remained in the ancient plain form, "May the Lord God remember all of you and all pious and Orthodox Christians in his kingdom . . . May the Lord God remember your priesthood and your diaconate . . . May the Lord God remember all those who have 'fallen asleep' with the hope of resurrection to life eternal . . ."[1188] (Archieratikon, edition of the Apostolikē Diakonia, Athens 1971, p. 20), but in practice we recognize that nowadays it is much more detailed. The natural posture of

1186. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika,* 127.

1187. Χρυσόστομος Φιλίππων καὶ Νεαπόλεως, *Ἱεροτελεστικόν* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1948), 257.

1188. "Πάντων ὑμῶν καὶ πάντων τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν μνησθείη Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ . . . Τῆς ἱερωσύνης ὑμῶν καὶ τῆς διακονίας σου μνησθείη . . . Πάντων τῶν ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἀναστάσεως ζωῆς αἰωνίου μνησθείη κεκοιμημένων . . ."

the hierarch is facing the people, inasmuch as he receives the holy gifts at the beautiful gate.

From the hierarchical Liturgy, the commemoration migrated, initially, to priestly concelebrations and afterwards to the simple priestly Liturgy. That this is something disorderly, we have written repeatedly. It is attested to neither by the manuscripts nor also by the printed editions, old or new. It must have been introduced around the end of the eighteenth century. The priestly concelebrations are the intermediate station, from which hierarchical practices are introduced into the priestly Liturgy. During these concelebrations, the Divine Liturgy is celebrated more splendidly, and it follows that festive elements are borrowed from hierarchical practice, especially when archimandrite/abbots of monasteries preside, or clergymen who hold administrative ranks in church eparchies. So far, this is normal. The abbots and other office-holding clergymen have hierarchical privileges, which are displayed in both their vestments and other emblems, in principle only of hierarchical dignity, even during the celebration of sacred services. Thus, for example, they wear an epigonation and cross, hold the pastoral ravdos, or even wear a mitre in some places; the ancient phēmē of the emperors ("Lord, save the pious"[1189] or "the emperors") is chanted, and their own phēmē during their Liturgies; and by hierarchical dispensation, they celebrate a dedication,[1190] and so forth. In the Divine Liturgy during concelebrations, the chanting by the clergy of the eisodikon, the apolytikia, and the trisagion has become officially prevalent, and additionally the censing after the small entrance and the commemoration during the great entrance is tending to become widespread.[1191] It is difficult for a criterion to be defined, on the basis of which one might judge

1189. "Κύριε, σῶσον τοὺς εὐσεβεῖς."

1190. Namely, the consecration of a temple.

1191. The words, "by the clergy," were added in the translation for clarification. The hierarchical Liturgy retains the remnants of the procession into the temple accompanied by the multiple ephymnia where nowadays the trisagion is chanted five times instead of the three (normally done in a priestly Liturgy) with the participation of the hierarch and clergy in the chanting. In concelebrations without the hierarch, Phountoulēs refers to the introduction and "official" prevalence of this practice without the support of the manuscript tradition. Ephymnia are discussed in questions 237, 238, 260, and 286.

up to where the imitation of hierarchical practice is permitted and up to where it must stop.

In the simple priestly Liturgy, we can be more categorical. Inasmuch as the ancient and correct taxis, which is attested to by the entirety of the Church's written liturgical tradition, does not recognize a commemoration during the great entrance, it must not be done. Practical reasons also exist that necessitate that it should not be done, such as a prolongation of the entrance, the specific association of the offering of the Divine Liturgy with only certain persons, as well as the occasional errors that are sometimes observed. Consequently, for us to respond directly to the questions, the priest would not commemorate turned towards the people, nor in the middle of the temple, nor before the tray of kolyba. A permissible commemoration of names could be done only in private Liturgies during weekdays, and this by oikonomia. The names of the faithful are commemorated at the holy prothesis, the ektenēs, and the diptychs. A fourth commemoration at the great entrance is also unnecessary.

What about in concelebrations? Even here the commemoration is not justified by our written tradition. The hierarch does not enter but receives the gifts. The presider of the concelebrants enters and prays while walking. For the moment, let us accept what takes place as proper. If a deacon also concelebrates, only the first one who holds the chalice will commemorate. However, if, as sometimes happens, a deacon is not concelebrating and the paten is held by the priest, what happens? Should not he himself then commemorate the living, by analogy to the hierarchical practice? I think this would be fair. However, the orderly thing is for both the deacon and the priest to be satisfied with the ancient and concise "May the Lord God remember . . .."[1192]

1192. Phountoulēs is implying that neither the deacon nor priest has a legitimate claim to an essentially hierarchical practice. Indirectly, he is also responding to the question concerning the privileges of a celibate priest, such as an archimandrite, making the commemoration.

293

Does the word, "ἀνενόχως" (guiltlessly) in the second prayer for the faithful of the Divine Liturgy of Chrysostomos refer to "λατρεύειν" (to worship) or to "μετέχειν" (to partake)?

The question above relates to a syntactical problem that the second prayer on behalf of the faithful from the Divine Liturgy of the sacred Chrysostomos presents. The matter is not so simple nor of small significance, as one might superficially characterize it. The understanding of the meaning, the interpretation, and consequentially the correct reading of our text depends on the syntax.

"Ἀνενόχως" (Guiltlessly) is contained in the last phrase of the prayer: "δὸς αὐτοῖς πάντοτε μετὰ φόβου καὶ ἀγάπης λατρεύειν σοι ἀνενόχως καὶ ἀκατακρίτως μετέχειν τῶν ἁγίων σου μυστηρίων καὶ τῆς ἐπουρανίου σου βασιλείας ἀξιωθῆναι." If "ἀνενόχως" (guiltlessly) refers to "λατρεύειν" (to worship), the meaning will be: "grant to them the grace in order to worship you without guilt of sin, with fear and love, and without condemnation to partake of your holy mysteries . . ." (Seraphim Papakōstas, *Handbook of the Divine Liturgy*, Athens 1969[8], p. 79).[1193] A comma, which is unnecessary, must be implied after "ἀνενόχως" (guiltlessly), because the next phrase begins with "καί" (and) ("καὶ ἀκατακρίτως μετέχειν," and without condemnation to partake).[1194] However, despite this, we find a comma at this point in many printed editions (see Euchologion, editions of Venice 1832, 1862. Euchologion of Goar 1730. The Divine Liturgies, editions of Venice, 1795, 1811, 1848, 1881, of Constantinople 1875, of Athens 1865, 1892, 1927, and others), but without this necessarily signifying that the editors gave this meaning to the phrase, because the comma before "καί" (and) is customary in the printed editions of our liturgical texts. According to this syntax, the phrase presents a certain harmony; one adverb is assigned to each infinitive ("λατρεύειν," to worship — "ἀνενόχως," guiltlessly; "μετέχειν,"

1193. Σεραφείμ Παπακώστα, *Ἐγκόλπιον τῆς θείας λειτουργίας*, 8th ed. (Ἀθῆναι: ἔκδοσις Ἀδελφότης Θεολόγων, ἡ "Ζωή," 1969), 79. Phountoulēs presents a modern Greek translation by Papakōstas.

1194. Phountoulēs is emphasizing that the comma is not necessary because of the conjunction, "καί (and)," in the text.

to partake — "ἀκατακρίτως," without condemnation). However, the "καί" (and) after "ἀνενόχως" (guiltlessly) properly ought to be absent. Thus, the sentence would be more acceptable ("λατρεύειν σοι ἀνενόχως, ἀκατακρίτως μετέχειν . . . καί . . . ἀξιωθῆναι," to worship you guiltlessly, without condemnation to partake . . . and . . . to be deemed worthy). This could make us somewhat doubtful regarding the correctness of the syntax if such manners of syntax were unknown in our liturgical language.

If now we connected "ἀνενόχως" (guiltlessly) with "μετέχειν" (to partake), the phrase will give us a different meaning: "Grant to them always with fear and love to worship you, without guilt and without condemnation to partake of your holy mysteries and to be deemed worthy . . ." (Panagiotēs Trempelas, *Leitourgikon*, Athens 1970[5], p. 67).[1195] In this case, a comma must be placed after "λατρεύειν σοι" (to worship you), which we indeed encounter in some printed editions (Hieratikon, editions of the Apostolikē Diakonia 1951, 1962, 1968. Archieratikon, edition of the Apostolikē Diakonia 1971), a thing which signifies that the meaning of the phrase puzzled the editors, and they clearly preferred this interpretation to the previous one, because otherwise they would not have placed the punctuation mark there. Thus, the clause loses the harmonious distribution of adverbs that we noted above, but is syntactically more acceptable, since only the final last clause is connected with "καί" (and) ("λατρεύειν σοι, ἀνενόχως . . .μετέχειν . . .καί . . .ἀξιωθῆναι," to worship you, guiltlessly . . . to partake . . . and . . . to be deemed worthy). In the framework of the whole prayer, according to this manner of the syntax, the two adverbs, "ἀνενόχως καὶ ἀκατακρίτως" (guiltlessly and without condemnation), come in a position parallel to two adjectives that are found in its first part: "ἀνένοχον καὶ ἀκατάκριτον" (guiltless and free from condemnation). The priests will be deemed worthy guiltlessly and without condemnation to officiate and the faithful "ἀνενόχως καὶ ἀκατακρίτως" (guiltlessly and without condemnation) to partake of the mysteries. Nikolaos Kabasilas also interprets the prayer ac-

1195. Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Λειτουργικόν*, 5th ed. (Ἀθῆναι: Ἀδελφότης θεολόγων "Ὁ Σωτήρ," 1970), 67. Phountoulēs presents a modern Greek translation by Trempelas.

cording to this parallelism of the entreaties, both adverbs referring to "μετέχειν" (to partake): "the priest prays for himself and the multitude, that he stands free from condemnation at the holy table pure 'of defilement of flesh and spirit'; and the faithful who pray with him are deemed worthy 'to partake of the mysteries,' without guilt and condemnation (χωρὶς ἐνοχῆς καὶ κατακρίσεως), and besides this to inherit the kingdom of heaven" (*Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 23.4).[1196] And theologically "ἀνενόχως" (guiltlessly) better suits approaching the mysteries than the worship of God.

Another word of this phrase has also undergone a corruption and has changed the meaning of the prayer. Instead of "λατρεύειν σοι" (to worship you), most ancient and late manuscripts read, "λατρεύουσί σοι" (who worship you)[1197] (*Athens S. 815, 713, S. 394, 662, 769, 661, 877, 703*, and others). The same reading is also preserved in certain old and modern edited printed publications (Euchologion, editions of Venice 1760, Rome 1873; Hieratikon, edition of Rome 1950). Still in certain manuscripts, instead of "λατρεύουσί σοι," the reading exists "λατρεύοντάς σοι" (*Barberini 336, Athens 685, 2086*).[1198] The correct one is, "λατρεύουσί σοι" (who worship you); the faithful attending, who worship God with fear and love, will be deemed worthy by him to guiltlessly partake of the mysteries. Thus, we have a new parallelism in the two parts of the truly masterful prayer: the priests' persistent ("πάλιν καὶ πολλάκις," again and oftentimes) and humble prayer ("σοὶ προσπίπτομεν," we fall before you) corresponds to the people's worship with fear and love.

The phrase, "δὸς αὐτοῖς πάντοτε μετὰ φόβου καὶ ἀγάπης λατρεύουσί σοι" (grant to them who always worship you with fear and love), has obviously been influenced by the similar phrase from the first prayer

1196. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 23.4 (SC 4bis:160–161).

1197. Λατρεύειν is the present infinitive of the verb λατρεύω; λατρεύουσι is the plural present active dative participle of the verb λατρεύω.

1198. Λατρεύοντας is the plural present active masculine accusative participle of the verb λατρεύω. The difference between the two participles is that the first one (λατρεύουσι) is in the dative and can be used in several ways syntactically including as an indirect object affected by the action of the verb often translated by using the words "to" or "for," such as "grant to them who worship you."

of Matins, "Εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι, Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, τῷ ἐξαναστήσαντι . . ." (We give thanks to you, O Lord our God, who raises . . .): "καὶ δὸς αὐτοῖς μετὰ φόβου καὶ ἀγάπης πάντοτε σοὶ λατρεύειν, αἰνεῖν, ὑμνεῖν . . ." (and grant to them with fear and love always to worship [λατρεύειν], praise, hymn you [σοί] . . ."). Perhaps from the influence of this prayer, "λατρεύουσί σοι" (who worship you), of our prayer has also been changed into the easier, "λατρεύειν σοι" (to worship you), from the first prayer of Matins, although "λατρεύειν σοι" (to worship you) of this prayer presents the same variations in certain manuscripts ("λατρεύοντας" and "λατρεύουσι").

Thus, this explains why Kabasilas in the free translation of the second prayer of the faithful passes over "λατρεύειν σοι" (to worship you) in silence; in the manuscript that he had in mind there was "λατρεύουσί σοι," which does not present worship "with fear and love" as an entreaty, but as a statement regarding the faithful's manner of worship. Precisely this prayer conceptually requires stress on the petitions that refer to the theme of the celebration of the mystery of the divine Eucharist and participation in it. Liturgically, the prayer constitutes the connection of the first part of the sacred synaxis with the second, namely, the performance of the mystery.

Consistent with what we wrote above, the correct text of this phrase of the second prayer of the faithful is as follows: "δὸς αὐτοῖς πάντοτε μετὰ φόβου καὶ ἀγάπης λατρεύουσί σοι, ἀνενόχως καὶ ἀκατακρίτως μετέχειν τῶν ἁγίων σου μυστηρίων καὶ τῆς ἐπουρανίου σου βασιλείας ἀξιωθῆναι." This could be rendered in the modern language as follows: "Grant to them who always with fear and love worship you, to partake in your holy mysteries without guilt and without condemnation and to be accounted worthy of your heavenly kingdom."[1199]

1199. Phountoulēs is presenting a Modern Greek translation of the liturgical text. The current Hieratikon of the Ecumenical Patriarchate (2020) adopted the change suggested by Phountoulēs. However, this change was not incorporated into the current official text of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America (2018). The edition of the Apostolikē Diakonia (2019) stops short of making the correction but adds a footnote for the variant reading (λατρεύουσί σοι) and a discussion in the appendices that acknowledges its presence in a number of manuscripts.

294

During the Divine Liturgy, why do we first bless the holy bread and afterwards the chalice, while according to the gospel, the Lord first blessed the cup and afterwards the bread?

This statement of the inquirer is not entirely correct. During the mystical supper, the Lord first blessed the bread and then, "after supper," the cup. The accounts in question of the evangelists Matthew (26:26–28) and Mark (14:22–24), as well as the apostle Paul (1 Cor 11:23–26) are absolutely clear and unanimous. On their basis, the liturgical tradition of the Church, from the beginning and in all the liturgical forms of the Christian world, places the blessing of the bread before the blessing of the chalice.

In two places of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, Saint Paul puts the cup before the bread, but here, he is not being precise nor specifically referring to the sequence for the consecration of the precious gifts. In the first instance, he speaks regarding the faith of the Church, that "the cup of blessing which we bless" is a communion of the Blood of Christ and that the bread "which we break" is a communion of the Body of Christ. He randomly places them in this sequence, or leaves the bread as second, since he wants to develop the theological consequences of the communion of the faithful "from the one bread" (1 Cor 10:16). In the second instance, he is simply contrasting the "cup of the Lord" to the "cup of demons" and the "table of the Lord" to the "table of demons" (1 Cor 10:21). This becomes clear a little bit further down in the same epistle, where in speaking about the tradition of the mystery, its celebration by the Church in imitation of the practice of the Lord, he precisely places matters in their correct sequence (1 Cor 11:23–26). In the *Didachē of the Twelve Apostles*, a very ancient Christian text of the second century, the blessing of the "mixture"[1200] (of the chalice) indeed precedes and the blessing of the "breaking"[1201] (of the bread) follows, but here, the problem is complex. Rather it refers to the blessing of the agapes

1200. "κράματος."
1201. "κλάσματος."

than to the celebration of the mystery of the divine Eucharist (*Didachē* 9.2).[1202]

The impression that the Lord first blessed the cup during the mystical supper came from the narrative of the evangelist Luke, which is indeed read in the Church during the service of Matins of Great Thursday (Luke 22:1–39). Luke speaks regarding two cups, the first one of which is blessed at the beginning of the supper and the second at the end after the blessing of the bread. If we pay attention to the text, we will see that at the first cup there is no mention of the Lord's words, "this is my Blood . . .," but only at the second cup, as well as in the other evangelists and in the apostle Paul, which we saw above. According to the opinion of the commentators, the first cup is the first cup of either the Passover supper or of the familiar or celebratory meal of the Jews. Therefore, consistent with the form of these suppers, according to the evangelist Luke, the Lord offered to the apostles during the mystical supper two cups: the first cup, while saying "Take this and divide it among yourselves, for I tell you that from now on I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes" (Luke 22:18) and the second after the consecration and the partaking of the precious Body, the cup of the Blood of the New Testament (Luke 22:20).[1203] The other two evangelists, since they make no mention of the first cup, which did not interest them just as they were not interested in the other details

1202. *Didachē of the Twelve Apostles* 9.2 in *La doctrine des douze apôtres*, trans. and ed. Willy Rordorf and André Tuilier, SC 248 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1978),175–178. Neither the word, "κράμα" (mixture), or its genitive, "κράματος," appear in the referenced section of the *Didachē*. Phountoulēs discusses the agapes or common meals associated with the celebration of the Eucharist in question 60.

1203. As a speculation, the custom of dipping the Artoklasia in wine and its being provided as a 'small common meal,' as practiced on Mount Athos, could perhaps be connected to the first cup and the agapes being discussed. The consumption of the Artoklasia is described as preceding the Liturgy, "because it [the Artoklasia] was prescribed specifically owing to the fatigue of the vigil, that the brothers after having obtained blessed bread of Christ and a small refreshment owing to the fatigue, thereafter, may have prayer for communion of the awesome mysteries, and especially the clergy," Symeōn of Thessaloniki, *Dialogue*, chapter 342 (PG 155:620b). See Phountoulēs' discussion of the Artoklasia in questions 10 and 15.

of itsthe mystical supper aside from the tradition of the divine Eucharist, link the phrase that accompanied the offering of the first cup ("For I say to you, that I shall not drink . . .") with partaking from the cup of the precious Blood (Matthew 26:29, Mark 14:25). The explanation of Theophylaktos of Bulgaria is characteristic in this case: "Luke seems to mention two cups; and the one, of which he says, 'Take this and divide it among yourselves,' one might say is a type of the Old Testament; and the other, after breaking and distributing the bread, He himself distributes to the disciples, which He also calls of the New Testament and says it is initiated in his Blood."[1204]

One can read more about this topic in the different commentaries on the New Testament and in the recent book of the series from the Institute of Sacred Preachers of Thessaloniki, *The Saving Passion,* of Professor Iōannēs Karavidopoulos, press of the Sacred Monastery of Saint Theodōra, Thessaloniki, 1974.[1205]

295

In certain villages during the Vespers of the Sunday of Pascha ("the second resurrection"),[1206] they make a procession, and both take out and carry about the other icons of the temple apart from the icon of the Resurrection. Is it not proper for this to be done only during the Sunday of Orthodoxy?

1204. PG 123:1069a. Theophylaktos (Hēphaistos) of Ochrid (born mid-eleventh century–d. after 1125) was formerly a deacon of the cathedral of Saint Sophia in Constantinople, where he was educated in the 1070s and held the post of master of the rhetoricians while teaching in the patriarchal school. He was appointed as the fifth Byzantine archbishop of Ochrid on January 6, 1088, and wrote a large number of works, including Scriptural commentaries. For further information, see Michael Angold, *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Comneni, 1081–1261* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 158–172 and Margaret Mullet, *Theophylact of Ochrid: Reading the Letters of a Byzantine Archbishop* (London: Routledge, 1997).

1205. Ἰωάννης Καραβιδόπουλος, *Τὸ σωτήριον πάθος* (Θεσσαλονίκη: ἐκδοσις Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Ἁγίας Θεοδώρας, 1974). Iōannēs Karabidopoulos (b. 1937) is a New Testament professor at the Theological School of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. See the article of Professor Panagiotēs I. Skaltsēs on the life of Phountoulēs in volume one.

1206. "Δευτέρα ἀνάστασις."

The procession of the holy icons is indeed peculiar to the Sunday of Orthodoxy, during which, according to custom, a procession takes place within and around the temple in commemoration of the restoration of the holy icons and the victory of the correct faith concerning them over the heresy of the iconoclasts. In the Triōdion, the relevant rubric is found, according to which "after the dismissal of Matins and before the Liturgy we commonly process with the holy woods of the cross and the venerable icons."[1207]

However, apart from this instance, we also have processions of icons of celebrated saints, during their feasts of the temples commemorating their memory (in honor of these saints), unrelated to the feast of Orthodoxy and the procession during that day. Ecclesiastical practice also knows the carrying of icons in processions that take place either as expressions of repentance and contrition, or for celebration of radiant feasts.

Pseudo-Kōdinos (fourteenth century), for example, attests that during the procession of Palm Sunday and of the Indiction, they also carried icons (*Peri offikialiōn*, chapters 10 and 15).[1208] According to the unpublished Typikon of Saint Sophia of Thessaloniki that Symeōn of Thessaloniki (d. 1429) wrote, all the processions, such as for the Indiction, Palm Sunday, the eve of the Ascension, and so forth, took place "with holy icons."

Specifically, the procession of the icons during the Vespers of Pascha or during Renewal Week (customarily, on Tuesday of Renewal Week) is known not only from the parish practice of villages, but also from the Holy Mountain itself. Certainly, it is

1207. According to Orthodox tradition, the "holy woods" of Christ's cross consisted of cedar, pine, and cypress, which were regarded as prefigured in Isaiah 60:13. This tradition is reflected in the third troparion from the seventh ode of Matins for the Wednesday of the Fourth Week of the Triōdion, "Ὡς κυπάρισσον, συμπάθειαν ὡς κέδρον τε, πίστιν ἡδύπνοον, ὡς πεύκην ἀληθινήν, ἀγάπην προσφέροντες, τὸν τοῦ Κυρίου Σταυρόν, προσκυνήσωμεν, τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ δοξάζοντες, Λυτρωτὴν προσηλωθέντα" (While offering sympathy as the cypress, fragrant faith as the cedar, true love as the pine, let us venerate the Cross of the Lord, while giving glory to the Redeemer who was nailed on it).

1208. Pseudo-Kōdinos, *De Officiis* 10, 15 in *Pseudo-Kodinos and the Constantinopolitan Court: Offices and Ceremonies*, ed. and trans. R. Macrides and J.A. Munitz, D. Angelov (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2013), 250–261, 266–269.

not specifically provided for by the Typikon, but this does not have particular significance. This is obviously about a very old custom that aims at emphasizing the completely joyous event of the Resurrection of the Lord. In this triumphant procession of the Church militant, the Church triumphant also participates. And visibly, in some manner, the saints through their icons are accompanying and concelebrating the triumph of the Risen One with the faithful living in the world.

Symeōn of Thessaloniki also speaks regarding processions that were done either "on account of thanksgiving for good things bestowed"[1209] (such as the procession of the Resurrection), or as "entreaties to God and common supplications also on account of impending wrath,"[1210] during which they also carried sacred icons through cities and farmlands. We cite his pertinent words, which are very characteristic both for clear testimony regarding a procession of holy icons also outside of the feast of Orthodoxy and for the theological meaning that he gives to this procession: "And taking out the sacred icons from the temples we also carry the precious crosses and often the most sacred relics of saints, in order that houses, roads, waters, and air, and the filthy ground that is walked on by us, might be sanctified along with human beings and the things used by them, and inhabited city and countryside might partake of divine grace and reject what causes affliction and corruption, and the One might become merciful to us who became incarnate for us and who took the form of a servant, which divine icons represent and bear, and the forms of his saints who purely dwelt on the earth" (*Dialogue*, chapter 353).[1211]

296

During the Divine Liturgy, after "We have seen the true light,"[1212] the priest says inaudibly, "Blessed is our God"[1213] and

1209. PG 155:613b.
1210. PG 155:613b.
1211. PG 155:656b.
1212. "Εἴδομεν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν . . ."
1213. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός ἡμῶν."

says in exclamatory manner (ἐκφώνως),[1214] "Always, now and ever . . .."[1215] What meaning does this "Always, now and ever . . ." have without "Blessed is our God"? Is it perhaps better for them both to be said in an exclamatory manner, as also some priests do?

The meaning of the phrase, "Always, now and ever . . .," during the transfer of the Holy Elements from the altar to the holy prothesis after communion is among the most difficult points of the Divine Liturgy to explain. Different opinions have been expressed at times, an indication also itself of the difficulty in interpretation that its understanding presents. But also, the fluctuations that emerge in the liturgical development at this place are almost always products of a difficulty of interpretation and attempts for an understanding or smoothing out of the matter. Nevertheless, while following step-by-step the complex history of this element of the Divine Liturgy, we will attempt to see with as much clarity and simplicity as possible what its true meaning is, not as we might wish it, but as our liturgical tradition sheds light on it for us. The history of a liturgical form is always the best guide for the revelation of its meaning, consequently of the correct practice, "of that which must be done."[1216]

1214. The term "μυστικῶς" is translated as "inaudibly," and "ἐκφώνως" is translated "in an exclamatory manner." Regarding the meaning of "ἐκφώνως," Phountoulēs states in question 410:

> The ἐκφώνησις (exclamation) is the doxological epilogue of every single prayer, which is chanted melodically: ἐκφώνως (in an exclamatory manner). Namely, we can characterize the expression, ἐκφώνως (in an exclamatory manner) as a type of musical term, parallel to the phrase ἐκφωνητικὴ ψαλμῳδία (exclamatory chanting), which denotes the mode of melodious reading of sacred texts. In contrast, the prayer constitutes the main body of the text and is read either 'εἰς ἐπήκοον' (within earshot) of the people, according to the more ancient taxis, which still applies even today in the sacred mysteries apart from the Divine Liturgy, or 'μυστικῶς' (inaudibly), as became prevalent later in the prayers of the Divine Liturgy and of certain other services, namely of Vespers and Matins
>
> The "exclamatory chanting" can be compared to the singing used for dialogue and narrative in operas and oratorios. See also questions 551–553.

1215. "Παντοτε νῦν καὶ ἀεί."

1216. "δέοντος γενέσθαι," Plato, *Cratylus* 399a. This is a popular phrase in Modern Greek derived from Plato and signifying generally going above and beyond when used in the expression, "ὑπὲρ τοῦ δέοντος γενέσθαι."

According to the most ancient liturgical practice, the transfer of the remainders of the Eucharistic Species, after the communion of the clergy and the people, was done by the deacons or generally the clergy to the skeuophylakion or to the sacristy[1217] and later to the prothesis (as nowadays), without saying anything during this transfer.[1218] This is also attested to by the most ancient Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions* ("and when all the men and women partook, the deacons receiving the remainders carried them to the sacristy")[1219] and by the *Chronicon Paschale* (seventh century), Theodōros the Stoudite (*Explanation of the Divine Liturgy of the Presanctified Gifts*), and by other ancient writers. After the prayer of thanksgiving[1220] was said over the partaking of the Precious Gifts, which, as customary, the relevant diaconal exhortations to the people preceded, nothing was inserted between communion and the thanksgiving other than the blessing, "Save, O God, your people . . .,"[1221] which also itself does not appear to be very old, since it is also not encountered in the Liturgies of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, Saint Iakōvos, and Saint Markos. "Blessed is our God—Always, now and ever . . ." is not found at this place in any of the ancient Liturgies, nor is it found in the Byzantine Liturgies of Saint Basileios the Great, Saint Iōannēs Chrysostomos, and the Presanctified in their ancient form, as this is attested to by the very ancient manuscripts and the *Codex Barberini 336* itself from the eighth century. It is characteristic that it does not also exist either in the later manuscripts of the ancient Liturgies of Saints Iakōvos, Markos, and Peter, and the Armenian Liturgy, which accepted many influences from later Byzantine liturgical practice.

Initially, the exclamation, "Always, now and ever . . ." (more rarely only "Now and ever . . ."[1222]—*Codex Patmos 105*), appears

1217. "στὰ παστοφόρια." Lampe, s.v. "παστοφόριον, τό."

1218. This practice of complete silence is observed today as a custom in some villages of Greece during the transport of communion for the sick and others unable to attend Liturgy.

1219. *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.13.16 (SC 336:210–211).

1220. "Εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι, Δέσποτα φιλάνθρωπε, εὐεργέτα τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν . . ." ("We give thanks to you, Master who loves humankind, benefactor of our souls . . .").

1221. "Σῶσον ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαόν σου . . ."

1222. "Νῦν καὶ ἀεί . . ."

without "Blessed is our God." This exclamation is certainly strange, not because it does not seem to have meaning independently (and all other exclamations do not have an independent meaning without the prayer, such as for example, "Singing the triumphal hymn . . .,"[1223] "Especially for our most holy... . . .,"[1224] and so forth), but because there is no other such parallel in our liturgical practice, where a prayer does not precede, namely, of an exclamation without independence, such that the exclamation would constitute its melodic conclusion and seal.

In later manuscripts, especially from the sixteenth century onwards, we find "Blessed is our God"[1225] before "Always"[1226] so the matter is somewhat mitigated. However, the difficulty remains, because by a unique exception, the new phrase, "Blessed . . . always . . ."[1227] again is not said whole in an exclamatory manner but only the original conclusion (Always . . .), a matter that clearly attests to the later joining of those two phrases. In all these manuscripts, "Blessed is our God" is prescribed to be said "quietly,"[1228] "softly,"[1229] "inaudibly,"[1230] or "to himself"[1231] by the priest, while "Always, now and ever . . ." remains "in an exclamatory manner"[1232] or "within earshot."[1233] According to a singular exception, both clauses are required to be said "in an exclamatory manner"[1234] in the *Codex Byzantine Museum of Athens 13* from the sixteenth century. However, other witnesses from the manuscripts complicate matters still more. Instead of "Blessed is our God," other phrases or ones comparable to it are introduced, such as "Be exalted, O God, above the heavens . . ."[1235] or "God went

1223. "Τὸν ἐπινίκιον ὕμνον ᾄδοντα . . ."
1224. "Ἐξαιρέτως τῆς παναγίας . . ."
1225. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν."
1226. "Πάντοτε."
1227. "Εὐλογητὸς . . . πάντοτε . . ."
1228. "ἡσύχως."
1229. "ἠρέμα."
1230. "μυστικῶς."
1231. "καθ' ἑαυτόν."
1232. "ἐκφώνως."
1233. "εἰς ἐπήκοον," "in the hearing" of the people.
1234. "ἐκφώνως."
1235. "Ὑψώθητι ἐπὶ τοὺς οὐρανούς, ὁ Θεός . . ." (Psalm 56:6, 12).

up with shouting . . ."[1236] or "Glory to God who fills all things"[1237] or "The Lord ascended into the heavens and thundered . . ."[1238] or "Blessed is God who illumines and sanctifies . . ."[1239] or "I will exalt you, my God, my king,"[1240] namely, psalmic verses for the most part, the exclamation of which, "Always, now and ever . . .," is presented, and not that of "Blessed is our God." All this variety of the tradition is an additional witness that "Always, now and ever . . ." originally existed alone and that difficulty regarding its understanding caused some silent prayer to be sought before it, which finally prevailed to be "Blessed is our God."

However, since "Blessed is our God" or the other verses, as we saw above, were added afterwards, what meaning must the exclamation, "Always, now and ever . . .," originally have had alone, without the later hermeneutical "glosses"?[1241] We have to examine this exclamation in the context of the symbolic interpretations that were given to the Divine Liturgy, because it emerges precisely in a peak era of liturgical symbolisms. From the sacred commentators of the Divine Liturgy, we see a clear attempt for recognition in it and its individual elements, of a reenactment of the life and times of the Lord on the earth, and generally a recapitulation of his salvific work. Especially at this point of the last appearance of the Precious Gifts after holy communion and their returning to the holy prothesis, the last appearance of the risen Christ to his disciples and his Ascension into the heavens. The *Ecclesiastical History and Mystical Contemplation,* which goes under the name of Germanos I, patriarch of Constantinople, expressly states that, "the raising of the remaining Divine Remnants [of the Precious Gifts], alludes to the Ascension of the Lord and our God."[1242] Theodōros of Andida also repeats the same thing, "the raising of the remaining Divine Remnants, namely, alludes to the

1236. "Ἀνέβη ὁ Θεὸς ἐν ἀλαλαγμῷ . . ." (Psalm 46:6).
1237. "Δόξα τῷ πληροῦντι τὰ πάντα Θεῷ . . ."
1238. "Κύριος ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανοὺς καὶ ἐβρόντησεν . . ."
1239. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς ὁ φωτίζων καὶ ἁγιάζων . . ."
1240. "Ὑψώσω σε, ὁ Θεός μου ὁ βασιλεύς μου . . ." (Psalm 144:1).
1241. "γλῶσσες." Phountoulēs uses quotation marks for this term. A 'gloss' can be a notation and explanation made in the interpretation of a text.
1242. PG 98:452b.

Ascension of the Lord and our God . . . For when he was raised up at the Ascension . . ." (*Summary Commentary,* 38).[1243] Symeōn of Thessaloniki also insists on the same symbolism: "it represents the Ascension of the Savior" (*Explanation*, 100, *Dialogue*, chapter 99).[1244] It is obvious that the psalmic verses which we saw above are among those that are interpreted by our ecclesiastical tradition as referring prophetically to the occurrence of the divine Ascension. The latter two commentators, who we mentioned above, know and expressly testify or allude to the recitation of the verse, "Be exalted, O God, above the heavens and let your glory be over all the earth" (Psalm 56:6, 12),[1245] and apply it to the Ascension of the Lord, the commemoration and symbolical reenactment of which takes place during that moment ("for the priest then says, 'Be exalted . . . .' For when He was raised up at the Ascension, the angels said to the apostles, 'He himself who was taken up . . .,'" Theodōros of Andida, op. cit.[1246] "Then he censes the Holy Elements on the altar again, saying verses about the Ascension, thanking Him who for us was incarnate, suffered, rose in the flesh, was assumed to heaven, lives, and filled the whole earth with his glory," Symeōn, *Dialogue*, chapter 99.[1247] "Censing the gifts and saying in addition what represents the Ascension of the Savior and the glory after it of his proclamation to all creation, as if conversing with the Savior . . .," Symeōn, *Explanation*, 100[1248]). Therefore, it is clear that "Always, now and ever . . ." must be related to the liturgical symbolism dominant during that era. It is very likely that its meaning is that which Symeōn of Thessaloniki provides: "You came down to us and were seen among us and have ascended into heaven, and, having been taken up, you have filled the entire earth with the glory of your power, through which we,

1243. PG 140:465a.

1244. Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika,* 156–157, 260.

1245. "Ὑψώθητι ἐπὶ τοὺς οὐρανούς, ὁ Θεός, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἡ δόξα σου."

1246. PG 140:465a.

1247. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika,* 260–261.

1248. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika,*156–157.

doing the sacred-services of your mysteries, partake of you, and have you unceasingly with us" (*Explanation*, 100).[1249] In other words, that the Lord is taken up, but also now and always and up until the close of the age, continually renews his presence in the midst of his people, his Church, through his holy mysteries. The exclamation, "Always, now and ever . . .," is namely a liturgical remolding of the final words of the Lord when he was taken up, "and behold, I am with you always until the end of the age" (Matt 28:20).[1250]

In the Liturgies of Saint Markos and Saint Iakōvos, although not in all the manuscripts, the same psalmic verse (Psalm 56:6, 12) exists in combination with another psalmic verse (Psalm 18:10) with a slight adaptation: "Be exalted . . . your glory and your kingdom continue to the ages of ages."[1251] In the former, after, and in the latter, before the communion of the people. The reference to the symbolism of the Ascension and the relevance of the entire phrase to the "Always, now and ever . . ." of our Liturgies is obvious. Finally, in the Armenian Liturgy the blessing after holy communion, "Save, O God, your people . . .,"[1252] is concluded with the words of the Lord before his Ascension, "from now and until the end of the age."[1253]

As we saw, "Blessed is our God" is also itself introduced later. Is it unconnected to the ancient exclamation, "Always . . .," as a doxological exclamation of the priest at the conclusion of the mystery, or is it making up for the apparent space before the exclamation, by circles that either did not understand or did not sympathize with the symbolic meaning of this point, namely, the remembrance of the Ascension? It appears that Symeōn seems to share the first view. He alludes to "Blessed is our God" ("Having blessed God, he gives what is remaining from the Holy Elements to be carried away to the

1249. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 157.

1250. "Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος."

1251. "'Ὑψώθητι . . . ἡ δόξα σου καὶ ἡ βασιλεία σου διαμένει εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων."

1252. "Σῶσον ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαόν σου . . ."

1253. "ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος."

prothesis," *Explanation*, chapter 99),[1254] but as we saw passes over explaining, "Always, now and ever . . ." in connection with the "Be exalted . . ." and the Ascension. An analogous disconnected doxological exclamation is encountered in some manuscripts also in the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos before the communion of the faithful: "Blessed be the name of the Lord our God to the ages."[1255]

On the other hand, Nikolaos Kabasilas makes no reference to the symbolism of the Ascension and directly connects "Blessed is our God" to "Always, now and ever . . .." According to him, the entire phrase, "Blessed is our God . . . always . . .," constitutes the beginning of the thanksgiving after holy communion: "At this moment, the entire sacred work is completed, and the rite of the divine Eucharist ends. For the gifts were sanctified and themselves sanctified the priest and all those surrounding him and through them perfected and sanctified the remaining whole body of the church. This is why both the priest himself and the faithful surrounding him conclude in thanksgiving and glorification of God. And the former says, 'Blessed is our God Always, now and ever . . . Amen.' And the multitude sings . . ." (*Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 41.1–3).[1256] Two manuscripts also appear to argue in favor of this point of view (*Athens 775* and *765*, from the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, respectively), which place the diaconal command, "Bless, Master," before "Blessed is our God." A relevant point could be presented from the "Service of Trapeza" parallel to the Divine Liturgy. The entire service is concluded with the brief priestly prayer, "Blessed is God who shows mercy and nourishes . . . always, now and ever . . . ."[1257] The meaning is clear, but the time of the prayer's incorporation into the service is undetermined.

1254. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 261. The mistaken identification of the quotation as being from the *Dialogue* is corrected in the reference above.

1255. "Εὐλογητὸν τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας." B.-Ch. Mercier, ed. and trans., "La Liturgie de Saint Jacques: Édition critique du texte grec avec traduction latine," *Patrologia Orientalis* 26 (1946): 120.

1256. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 41.1–3 (SC 4bis:236–239). The reference is corrected based on the critical edition.

1257. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεός, ὁ ἐλεῶν καὶ τρέφων . . .πάντοτε νῦν καὶ ἀεί..."

The same variance is observed among the more modern commentators of the Divine Liturgy. Although he does not mention him, Fr. Gervasios Paraskevopoulos agrees with Kabasilas (*An Interpretative Overview on the Divine Liturgy*, Patras 1958, pp. 254–256).[1258] Fr. Seraphim Papakōstas gives almost the same interpretation (*Handbook of the Divine Liturgy*, Athens 1969[8], p. 145).[1259] Professor Panagiōtēs Trempelas argues in favor of separating the exclamation "Always, now and ever . . ." from "Blessed is our God," which he considers "that it constitutes a later addition, probably coming from a misinterpretation of 'Always, now and ever . . .'" (*The Three Liturgies*, Athens, 1935, pp. 151–152)[1260] and consequently interprets "Always, now and ever . . ." in connection with Matthew 26:29 and unrelated to "Blessed is our God," as a prayer "for the continual unity with Christ through his mysteries": "May we commune with Christ always now in this present life through the mysteries and always in the future life while being more tangibly united with him and remaining united with him to the endless ages. Amen" (*Leitourgikon*, Athens, 1973[7], pp. 131–133)[1261] or "May the Lord deem us worthy to commune with him, always, both now in this present life through the mysteries, but also unified with him to the endless ages and reigning jointly in his heavenly kingdom" (*From our Orthodox worship*, Athens, 1970, pp. 389–390).[1262]

It is noteworthy that the ancient symbolic significance of "Always, now and ever . . ." was not forgotten in modern times. Thus, the *Letters concerning the sacred services of the Eastern Catholic Church*, which were written in Russian (5th edition, Saint Petersburg, 1844) and translated into Greek by Theodōros Vallianos (2nd edition, Athens, 1864) comment on this element of the Divine Liturgy as

1258. Γερβάσιος Χαρ. Παρασκευόπουλος, *Ἑρμηνευτικὴ ἐπιστασία ἐπὶ τῆς θείας λειτουργίας* (Πάτραι: n.p., 1958), 254–256.

1259. Σεραφεὶμ Παπακώστα, *Ἐγκόλπιον τῆς θείας λειτουργίας*, 8th ed. (Ἀθῆναι: Ἔκδοσις Ἀδελφότης Θεολόγων, ἡ "Ζωή," 1969), 145.

1260. Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Αἱ Τρεῖς Λειτουργίαι*, 151-152.

1261. Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Λειτουργικόν*, 7th ed. (Ἀθῆναι: Ἔκδοσις Ἀδελφότης θεολόγων, "Ὁ Σωτήρ," 1973), 67.

1262. Παναγιώτης Τρεμπέλας, *Ἀπὸ τὴν ὀρθόδοξον λατρείαν μας* (Ἀθῆναι: Ἔκδοσις Ἀδελφότης θεολόγων, "Ὁ Σωτήρ," 1970), 389–390.

follows: "Then the Holy Gifts are once again presented to the people at the beautiful gate and are immediately hidden from the church[1263] in the prothesis. Then the celebrant calls to mind the last appearance of Christ to the apostles and his Ascension into the heavens, and as if he were going into the heavens in the same manner of Christ, he utters before the holy table, 'Blessed is our God,' in a manner that the church does not hear this, but only the end of the doxology comes into the hearing of the earth, from the midst of the beautiful gate, 'Always, now and ever . . .,' because the Lord promised to be with us to the ages" (pp. 22–23).[1264] An old, less well-known author, Nikolaos Persidēs, in his book, *Explanation of the sacred rites of the Eastern Orthodox Church*, Athens, 1903[2], which is written according to a question and answer format, attempts to combine the traditional symbolic interpretation in connection with "Blessed is our God." To the questions, "What does the appearance of the Holy Gifts again afterward to the people signify, after which they are hidden again?" and "What do the words recited at this appearance of the Gifts, 'Always, now and ever . . .,' signify?" he answers: "This signifies the Ascension of Jesus Christ into the heavens; and preceding this, the deacon's silent appearance to the people with the holy paten teaches that we always ought to gaze earnestly to the Lord with steadfast faith and firm hope, reminding ourselves that He will come quickly, so that He may recompense to each according to his works (Rev 2:12). And the words, 'Always, now and ever . . .,' signify that Christ who ascended, always remains invisibly with us and that He must be hymned and worshipped, hence also before this the celebrant recites

1263. The word "church" here is being used in the sense of "congregation."

1264. *Ἐπιστολαὶ περὶ τῶν Ἱερῶν Ἀκολουθιῶν τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας, Συγγραφεῖσαι μὲν Ῥωσσιστὶ καὶ τὸ πέμπτον ἤδη ἐκδοθεῖσαι τῷ 1844 ἔτει ἐν Πετρουπόλει, Μετενεχθεῖσαι δὲ εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διάλεκτον ὑπὸ Θεοδώρου Βαλλιάνου, Συνταγματάρχου τοῦ Μηχανικοῦ τῆς Ἑλλάδας* (Ἀθῆναι, Ἐκ τοῦ Τυπογραφεῖου Ἑρμοῦ, 1864), 23–24. This is a reprint of the 1851 version.

the following inaudibly, 'Blessed is our God,'[1265] namely, 'May our God be blessed'[1266]" (pp. 83–84).[1267]

The following conclusions come out of all that we in detail—but essentially in summary—wrote:

"Always, now and ever . . ." does not have a direct connection with "Blessed is our God" that nowadays precedes in our printed liturgical books, which on the basis of modern manuscripts retain the two later interpretive additions, "Be exalted . . ." and "Blessed is our God," and thus attempt to combine two different traditions. The psalmic verse conveys us to the ancient symbolisms of the Ascension, which had as an original and direct result, "Always, now and ever . . .." "Blessed is our God," must remain "inaudibly" as a doxological interjection unrelated to the symbolism and to the ancient exclamation, "Always, now and ever . . .." It is neither tied historically nor semantically to it. Let the priest say it "inaudibly," "softly," or "to himself," as always. Its recitation within earshot of the people perpetuates the misinterpretation.

297

Is it correct for us to perform the proskomidē with a knife, namely, for us to cut the lamb, the particles, and so forth with it and afterwards only formally for us to use the lance, without us cutting again with it, but simply for us to place it on the incisions while saying the various sacred words?

The answer to the previous question gave us the opportunity to speak incidentally regarding the symbolic interpretation of the sacred forms of the Divine Liturgy and to see that symbolisms not only

1265. "Εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν."

1266. The verb "εἴη" is the third person singular present optative active of "εἰμί" (to be) and can be translated "may . . . be . . . ."

1267. Νικόλαος Περσίδης, *Ἑρμηνεία τῶν ἱερῶν τελετῶν τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας: συναρμολογηθεῖσα ἐκ διαφόρων ἱερῶν βιβλίων καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ βάσει τῶν θείων συγγραφῶν τῶν θεοπνεύστων πατέρων τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, 2nd ed. (Ἀθῆναι: Τυπογραφεῖον "Ἑστία," 1903), 83–84. The first edition was published under the title, *Φιλόχριστος Ἑρμηνεία τῶν Ἱερῶν Τελετῶν τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς Ὀρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας* (Κωνσταντινούπολις: Ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου "Ἡ Φιλία," 1864) and the corresponding texts, 62–63, were revised in the later printing.

explained previously existing forms, but also inherently influenced the creation and development of liturgical forms. We also precisely observe this regarding the preparation of the bread in the prothesis. Namely, while originally the required preparation of the gifts was done with a common knife, the instrument for cutting the bread assumed the form and the name of the lance in order for that lance to be symbolized, with which the Lord's side was wounded on the cross (John 19:34). With it, not only the piercing of the right side of the lamb was done in remembrance of the Lord's side being pierced by the lance, but also the cutting and the excision of the lamb from the prosphoro, its crosswise cutting, and the crosswise sealing of the bread being offered that took place beforehand. When the particles for the Theotokos and the ranks and the particles offered for the living and the dead were later introduced, again the required incisions were done with the lance, so that no other instrument was used during the performance of the proskomidē.

From the twelfth century onwards, the standard rubrics of the manuscripts, including the *Diataxis of the Divine Liturgy* of Philotheos, expressly speak regarding this use of the lance, and only of it. Of the Fathers, Theodōros the Stoudite already makes mention of the "priestly lance" (*Against the iconoclasts,* 1).[1268] Among the sacred commentators of the Divine Liturgy, Germanos of Constantinople and Theodōros of Andida state that this lance "is in place of the lance that pierced Christ on the cross by Longinos . . . although it is not yet the time for this" (Germanos, *Ecclesiastical History and Mystical Contemplation*; and Theodōros of Andida, *Summary Commentary,* 9).[1269] Sōphronios of Jerusalem speaks regarding the bread that "is cut . . . by the deacon or even the priest with an iron, which they

1268. PG 99:489b.

1269. PG 98:397c, 397d; PG 140:430b. The first part of the quote is not shared by Theodōros of Andida. The words, "although it is not yet time for this," refer to the fact that the bloodless sacrifice is not yet accomplished at the prothesis with the preparation of the gifts but will take place in the celebration of the Eucharist. The use of the lance does not bring about the passion and the sacrifice of the cross realized during eucharistic celebration proper. On the significance of the prothesis and the excision of the particles in general, see questions 180–182.

call a lance," and the incision is done by it "lest we forget the immaculate side pierced with a lance in the holy Passion on the cross, at which time there immediately came forth blood and water" (*Oration containing all ecclesiastical history*, 10 and 8).[1270] Nikolaos Kabasilas explains in a more detailed manner what is done in the prothesis and the significance of the use of the lance: "He writes on it the marks of Christ's passion and death, just as on a tablet; all the actions the priest does, the ones by necessity, the others purposely, are subject to this meaning; and what is done at that time is a narrative in action of the saving passion and death . . .[1271] [He shows] thus the Lord came to the passion, died, was pierced in the side, blood and water then poured forth from the pierced side . . .[1272] After thrusting the iron many times, he then cuts the bread . . .[1273] For he marks a cross on the bread . . . and after this he pierces the bread as on the right side, describing by the bread's wound, the wound of that side. For on this account, he calls the afflicting iron 'a lance,' and it has been made in the form of a lance in order that it might remind one of that lance.[1274] And in this way describing these things through action, he also reads the words of the account, 'And one of the soldiers . . .'"[1275] (*Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 6–8). Symeōn of Thessaloniki writes in an analogous manner (*Dialogue*, chapter 84–85). The same one also speaks regarding the excision of the particles by means of the lance (*Dialogue*, chapter 94).

In the face of such a unanimous and continuous tradition, it would be easy to conclude the discussion, excluding the use of any other cutting utensil during the performance of the proskomidē, if it was not well known that our priests, although they know the

1270. PG 87: 3989c, 3989a. The original chapter order in the text was reversed to match their citation.

1271. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 6.2 (SC 4bis:80–81).

1272. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 6.5 (SC 4bis:82–83).

1273. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 8.2 (SC 4bis:88–89).

1274. Namely, the holy lance of Saint Longinos (Ἅγιος Λογγίνος).

1275. John 19:34; Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 8.3 (SC 4bis:88–89).

tradition and do not call it into question, face a problem in practice that forces them to come up with what the questioner writes. In recent times, the ecclesiastical vessel industry nearly changed the holy lance into a purely decorative holy vessel "accessory," without any practical value. It is well known that it is often impossible for anyone to cut the bread with this lance, and not even for one to firmly hold it in his hand. The old lances, which were produced by experienced craftsmen who knew not only the symbolic but also the practical purpose of this instrument in the Divine Liturgy, were indeed "iron implements," often with a wooden handle and with a sufficient cutting surface area that the priests took care to sharpen in order for it to be suitable for excising the lamb and the particles, as the standard rubrics require. Nowadays, it is not an exaggeration to say that the Church does not control the monitoring or guidance for the production of sacred vessels. Thus, the lance became "a shadow of a lance." If matters remain on the road that they are now heading, the use of the lance will end up being purely formal, as the questioner describes, and in the next generation, the new priests will ultimately turn to the knife and will learn in school that our fathers persisted in performing the proskomidē with this strange instrument because they were very theoretical and symbolic people, but not at all practical and down to earth.

298

During the Divine Liturgy, why do we first exclaim "Take, eat . . ." and "Drink of it, all . . ." and then bless the bread and the wine, while during the mystical supper the Lord first blessed and afterwards said, "Take, eat" and so forth?

Question number 294 has some points in common with this present one. However, the question here is essentially different. In the accounts of the Gospels and the apostle Paul concerning the mystical supper, namely, the transmission by the Lord of the mystery of the divine Eucharist before the Lord called the apostles to commune ("Take, eat . . ." "Drink of it all . . ."), first "he blesses" (εὐλογεῖ) or "he gives thanks" (εὐχαριστεῖ) (Matt 26:26–27, Mark 14:22–23,

Luke 22:10–20, 1 Cor 11:24–25).[1276] And even when the sacred authors do not employ one of the two terms above in regard to the cup, instead they use the adverb, "likewise" (ὡσαῦτως) (Luke 22:20, 1 Cor 11:25) whenever the verb "having blessed" (εὐλογήσας) or "having given thanks" (εὐχαριστήσας) is also meant by this. Whether with the "blessing" (εὐλογία) or "giving of thanks" (εὐχαριστία) that preceded the "words of institution" of the mystery (namely, "Take, eat" "Drink . . ."), a consecration of the Eucharistic species is meant, as we understand it nowadays, namely, a change into the Body and Blood of the Lord, or simply a thanksgiving doxological prayer is meant, and the consecration took place with the words of institution; this is a topic that concerns the exegetes and dogmaticians. We could only note that the same terms "to give thanks" (εὐχαριστεῖν) or "to bless" (εὐλογεῖν) are used in the New Testament, apart from the particular instances above, also in the other instances with the second meaning, without being understood that the elements being blessed were changed into the Body and Blood of Christ; for example, in the blessing of the five loaves (Matt 14:9, Mark 6:41, Luke 9:16), the seven loaves (Matt 15:36, Mark 8:6–7), as well as the blessing of the loaf at Emmaus (Luke 22:30), where it is doubtful whether this concerns the mystery of the divine Eucharist or the blessing of a common table's bread.

However, regardless of this hermeneutical issue, the entire liturgical tradition, at least for the East, as testified to by the relevant parallels for the prayer of the anaphora of various Liturgies, sees in the terms "giving of thanks" (εὐχαριστία) or "blessing" (εὐλογία) this clear consecratory act of the Lord of changing the bread into the Body and the cup into the Blood of Christ before the dominical words, "Take, eat . . ." and "Drink of it . . . ." A brief retrospection into the main Greek anaphoras suffices for the point to be demonstrated: In the Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, "looking up toward you, his God and Father, and breaking he gave . . . likewise mixing the cup of wine and water and sanctifying, he again gave . . . ."[1277] In the Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos, "looking up to heaven and showing forth

1276. See Appendix 1 for a comparison of the Scriptural texts.

1277. *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.12.35 (SC 336:196–199).

to you, God and Father, having given thanks, blessed, sanctified, broken, he imparted . . . likewise . . . gazing earnestly to heaven and showing forth to you, God and Father, having given thanks, blessed, sanctified, filled with the Holy Spirit, he imparted . . .." In the Liturgy of Saint Markos, "looking up to heaven toward you, his own Father, our God and God of all, having given thanks, blessed, sanctified, broken, he distributed . . . likewise . . . looking up . . . having given thanks, blessed, sanctified, filled with the Holy Spirit, he imparted . . . ."[1278] In an excerpt from the anaphora of Saint Epiphanios of Cyprus, "showing forth to you, God and Father, having given thanks, sanctified, he gave . . . likewise . . . he sealed a cup of immortality and gave . . . ."[1279] In the Alexandrian Liturgy of Basileios the Great, "looking up to the heights of the heavens toward you, his own Father, our God and the God of all, having given thanks, blessed, sanctified, broken, he imparted . . . likewise . . . having given thanks, blessed, sanctified, tasted again he gave . . . ."[1280] In the Alexandrian Liturgy of Grēgorios the Theologian, "you raised your head toward your own Father, our God and the God of all, gave thanks, blessed, sanctified, broke, imparted . . . likewise . . .you gave thanks, blessed, sanctified, imparted . . . ."[1281] Finally, in both our so well-known Byzantine Liturgies, in that of the sacred Chrysostomos for the bread, "having given thanks and blessed, sanctified, broke, he gave . . . ," but more clearly in that of the Liturgy of Basileios the Great, "showing forth to you, God and Father, having given

1278. *The Liturgy of Saint Mark*, ed. Geoffrey J. Cuming, OCA 234 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1990), 40–42 69–74, 122–125.

1279. This is considered a spurious work (CPG 2:3797) translated from Armenian, G. Garitte, "Un opuscule grec traduit de l'arménien" *Le Muséon* 73 (1960): 297–310; B. Botte, "Fragments d'une anaphore inconnue attribuée à S. Épiphane," *Le Muséon* 73 (1960): 311–315; and Ἰ. Φουντούλης, "Ἡ εὐχὴ τῆς ἀναφορᾶς τοῦ ἁγίου Ἐπιφανίου Κύπρου," in *Θεολογικὸν Συμπόσιον. Χαριστήριον εἰς τὸν καθηγητὴν Π. Κ. Χρήστου* (Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδόσεις Γρηγόρη, 1967), 215–244.

1280. On this text, see John R.K. Fenwick, *The Anaphoras of St. Basil and St. James: An Investigation into their Common Origin*, OCA 240 (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Orientale, 1992), 123–146.

1281. See question 200 for sources regarding this Liturgy.

thanks, blessed, sanctified, broke, he gave . . . ."[1282] Saint Symeōn of Thessaloniki who comments on this liturgical tradition and bases himself on it comes to the conclusion that "He [Christ] also did the sacred-service by means of prayers, although being almighty God he had no need of prayers. But by doing so he showed that the power of the Trinity is one, and that in carrying out his own actions he has the Father consenting and the Holy Spirit collaborating, just as occurred in his divine incarnation" (*Explanation*, 88).[1283]

Therefore, the observation of the questioner is precise. According to our liturgical texts, the Lord first consecrated the bread and the cup, and therefore changed them into Body and Blood, and afterwards offered them to the disciples while saying the words of institution. To the question now, why our ecclesiastical practice does the opposite, namely saying first "Take, eat" and "Drink of it" and afterwards through the invocation of the Holy Spirit the gifts being consecrated, Nikolaos Kabasilas succinctly answers that the description of the mystical supper during the Divine Liturgy and the exclamation of Lord's words by the priest take place "in the form of a narrative" (*Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 29.22).[1284] Or, as Symeōn of Thessaloniki notes, "when the priest narrates to the Father in detail and praises in song the events of the economy of salvation, he first cries out Christ's divine words since He handed this down, and since for this reason 'we offer to you these things on behalf of all,' according to His command. Further, 'we beg you, send your Spirit'" (*Explanation*, 88). And further below, "narrating . . . he says these words to the Father" (op. cit.).[1285]

In other words, in order for us to understand the course of the liturgical prayer we must also have in mind the structure of any other prayer in our divine worship. They usually begin with a doxology,

---

1282. See Appendix 2 of this volume for a table comparing the prayers of the anaphora for the Liturgies cited.

1283. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*,144–145.

1284. Nikolaos Kabasilas, *Explanation of the Divine Liturgy*, 29.22 (SC 4bis:190–191).

1285. Translation modified from Steven Hawkes-Teeples, *St. Symeōn of Thessalonika*, 140–141.

long or short, and proceed to the commemoration of those elements of the divine economy that foreshadow or justify the ecclesiastical practice; while emboldened by these things, the Church comes to invoke the consecrating grace of the Holy Spirit for the performance of the corresponding sanctifying practice and concludes the prayer with the enumeration of the fruits that the faithful will reap from it according to the Lord's will, and with a Trinitarian doxological seal. What takes place in all the prayers, is especially observed in the prayer of the holy anaphora, the central consecratory prayer of the mystery of the divine Eucharist, which constitutes the highest and most radiant worshipful expression of the Church. It is directed to God the Father; glorifies him for his majesty and his marvelous works. It thanks him for his love for the human race and infinite benevolence towards it, and particularly for the renewal of humanity that took place through the work of economy in Christ. It recounts the principal points of his work and especially the transmission of the divine Eucharist to the disciples during the mystical supper and his wish for us to perform the Eucharist in remembrance of him and for us to be incorporated into one body through communion with Him, thus personally making our own the work of salvation. This action and desire of the Lord precisely give the Church the power and authority in the Holy Spirit to repeat the mystery, and so to invoke his visitation for the change and transformation of the gifts of the Church into the Body and Blood of Christ.

The institutive words and the action of the Lord are compared by the Fathers of the Church to "let the earth bring forth . . ."[1286] and the "increase and multiply . . ."[1287] of creation. What was once said then forever energizes and empowers created nature in the renewal of creation, just as also the mystagogy that was once performed then, by the power of the sacred-service of the Lord through the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is repeated by the Church. We also have here a Trinitarian Liturgy for the renewal of the world, just as in the incarnation of God the Word: and here the Father is well-pleased,

1286. Gen 1:11.
1287. Gen 1:28.

the Holy Spirit comes and changes the Eucharistic species into the Body and Blood of the Son, the Christ.

Related to this topic, much has been written during the later Byzantine era and by more modern ones, because there exists between the East and the West, as is well known, a theological difference with regard to the time of the consecration of the precious gifts during the Holy Eucharist, namely, whether the change takes place during the words of institution or during the invocation. The question we are also examining here, and without us wishing it, has a connection to this theological issue.

However, in short, in order for us to remain as far as possible away from this lengthy and difficult theological debate, we can immediately respond to the question that was posed above: The Lord in the mystical supper first consecrates and afterwards offers. In a narrative manner, the Church refers to this action and to the words of the Lord and emboldened by this and by its power invokes the grace of the Holy Spirit for the repetition and perfection of the mystery and afterwards offers it for communion. Namely, essentially, it[1288] does precisely the same thing; first it consecrates and after offers. The reverse is in appearance only.[1289]

299

When is it preferable for the palms to be distributed during Palm Sunday, during lauds or at the end of the Divine Liturgy?

The questioner explains why he considers the second more preferable: During lauds only a small part of the congregation is found in the temple; the movement of the faithful creates disorder during the distribution; if for the remaining congregation they are distributed by another person at the entrance of the temple, the people would not be receiving the palms, as desired, "from the hand of the priest." Their distribution must necessarily take place at the same time as the distribution of antidōron at the end of the service, as usually takes

1288. The ecclesiastical practice.

1289. A comparison of Scriptural passages related to the mystical supper and texts from the anaphora of the various Liturgies cited appears in two appendices.

place with flowers during the Exaltation of the Precious Cross and the Veneration of the Cross. The reasons put forward are in any case serious and the proposed solution up for discussion.

We shall see what the liturgical tradition tells us regarding this, what theoretical and practical purpose the distribution of palms aims at, and we shall attempt to find the most correct solution that will serve and accommodate the present pastoral realities, but without being distant, to the extent possible, from the tradition of the Church.

According to the most ancient liturgical tradition, during Palm Sunday, a procession was performed before the Divine Liturgy. The first witnesses regarding this come from Jerusalem (*Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, 31, Jerusalemite *Kanonarion*, ninth–tenth century), which also seems to be the homeland of this procession.[1290] It took place right there, from the Mount of Olives to the temple of the Resurrection. During the preparatory service on the Mount of Olives, after the reading of the relevant gospel pericope that referred to the triumphal entrance of the Lord into Jerusalem (Matt 21:8–9), the procession began, in which the patriarch, the clergy, and the people participated, and all held palm or olive branches in remembrance precisely of the event that was celebrated. The procession ended in the temple of the Resurrection in Jerusalem where the Divine Liturgy was celebrated. Almost the same taxis is also attested to by the Typikon of the temple of the Resurrection from the year 1122 (*Codex T. Staurou 43*).[1291] In imitation of this procession, similar processions also took place in cities, villages, and monasteries. According to the Typikon of Saint Sophia of Constantinople from the ninth–tenth century (*Codices T. Staurou 40, Patmos 466*), in Constantinople, the procession began from the temple of the Holy Forty,[1292]

1290. *Itinerarium Egeriae* 31 (SC 296:272–275). Current scholarship predominantly attributes authorship of the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae* to a writer known as Egeria and titles the work, *Itinerarium Egeriae*. See question 230 for additional information on this source.

1291. Α. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας* (St. Petersburg: B. Κιρσπάουμ, 1894), 2:17.

1292. "Holy Forty" refers to the fourth century Holy Forty Martyrs of Sebaste.

where the patriarch distributed the palms "to the assembled clergy and people," and ended in the temple of Saint Sophia for the celebration of the Divine Liturgy.[1293] In the sacred palace, the emperor distributed palms by hand to the court officials during Saturday Vespers, obviously in order to use them during the procession on the next day (Kōnstantinos Porphyrogennētos, *The Book of Ceremonies*, 1.31–32).[1294] According to the Typikon of the Monastery of the Savior at Messina from the twelfth century, also again, the distribution of palms was done by the presider[1295] after the service of First Hour, in order to immediately begin the procession.[1296] According to the unpublished Typikon of the Great Church of Thessaloniki that Symeōn of Thessaloniki authored (*Hypotypōsis in synopsis of the services of feasts of the whole year*), the service of Matins was chanted by the archbishop and "all the clergy" in the temple of Saint Dēmētrios, from where processing during the morning with palms they came down and celebrated Liturgy in Saint Sophia.[1297] This ancient procession was also preserved in the monasteries, at least on the Holy Mountain, and takes place between Matins and Liturgy according to the taxis that has been in force from the beginning.

No mention is made regarding a prayer for blessing palms in many of the ancient Typika referred to above. Still in others, the

---

1293. Mateos, *Le Typicon de la Grande Église*, 2:66-67.

1294. Constantine Porphyrogennētos, *The Book of Ceremonies* 1.31–32 in *Constantine Porphyrogennetos: The Book of Ceremonies*, trans. Ann Moffat and Maxeme Tall, Byzantina Australiensia 18 (Boston: Brill, 2012), 170–177. The incorrect citation of 1.40–41 is corrected in the translation.

1295. "τὸν προεστῶτα." See question 302.

1296. Miguel Arranz, ed., *Le Typicon du Monastère du Saint-Sauveur à Messine, Codex Messinensi Gr 115, A.D. 1131, Introduction, Text Critique et Notes*, OCA 185 (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1969), 228.

1297. *Ὑποτύπωσις ἐν συνόψει τῶν ἀκολουθιῶν τῶν ἑορτῶν τοῦ ὅλου ἐνιαυτοῦ.* The word Hypotypōsis (Ὑποτύπωσις) can be translated as 'pattern,' and here is used similarly to the word 'Typikon' (which also can mean 'pattern' or 'order') as a regulation or rule. For a discussion of the names given to Typika, see C. Galatariotou, "Byzantine ktetorika typika: A Comparative Study," *Revue des études byzantines* 45 (1987): 77–138 and R. J. Jordan and Rosemary Morris, *The Hypotyposis of the Monastery of the Theotokos Evergetis, Constantinople (11th – 12th Centuries)* (London: Routledge, 2012), 2–3, 83–84.

prayer is provided for that exists in the Euchologia and our Hieratika, "O Lord our God, who sits upon the Cherubim, who raises up your might . . .,"[1298] which in these is characterized as a "prayer for blessing palms on Palm Sunday"[1299] (see also *Codex Sinai 966*), but in the manuscripts the title preferred is "Prayer for palms"[1300] or "for giving of palms"[1301] or "when palms are about to be given to the people"[1302] (*Codices Sinai 971, 982, 984, Vatopediou 134, Athens 94*, and others), which also appears more accurate. This is also why in the current prayer and in others that are encountered instead of it in the manuscripts, just as also in the prayer of inclination that accompanies it in other manuscripts, there is no mention regarding blessing palms. In other words, they are not prayers for blessing palms, but rather prayers for blessing the people who would take part in the procession, and which were said—before the distribution or "over" the branches, but even after it—as prayers of a procession, which all the prayers above allude to. Indeed, the current supposed "prayer for blessing palms"[1303] is encountered in the Typikon of the Resurrection from the year 1122 that we mentioned above, as a prayer said during the first station of the procession, namely, much after the distribution of the palms.[1304] Namely, the palms are sanctified not by priestly blessing and prayer but through their use during the procession and the Divine Liturgy that follows. The Jerusalemite *Kanonarion* has a detailed standard rubric, which we cited, according to which the reading of the prayer is combined with a specific festive ritual that had a true character of the blessing of palms: "They take the branches and place them next to the entrance of the sanctuary, cense crosswise, light tapers, and recite an ektenēs and a prayer and

1298. "Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν χερουβίμ, ὁ ἐξεγείρας τὴν δυναστείαν . . ."

1299. "Εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ εὐλογῆσαι βαΐα τῇ Κυριακῇ τῶν Βαΐων."

1300. "Εὐχὴ εἰς τὰ βαΐα."

1301. "εἰς τὸ δοῦναι βαΐα."

1302. "ὅτε μέλλῃ δοῦναι τὰ βαΐα τῷ λαῷ"

1303. "εὐχὴ εἰς τὸ εὐλογῆσαι βαΐα."

1304. Α. Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, *Ἀνάλεκτα Ἱεροσολυμιτικῆς Σταχυολογίας* (St. Petersburg: Β. Κιρσπάουμ, 1894), 2:17-18.

say a prokeimenon in tone six,[1305] 'Blessed is he that comes . . .,'[1306] the priest blesses the palms, and after the blessing distributes the branches to the people."

According to the relatively late monastic Typika (Triōdion, Typikon of Saint Sabas), the distribution of palms took place after the gospel of Matins during the chanting of Psalm 50, at the same time as the kissing of the Gospel book by the brethren (nowadays, the psalm is recited and there is no kissing of the Gospel book in parishes).[1307] The change obviously took place in order for the monks to hold the palms not only during the procession and Divine Liturgy, but also during Matins. According to the modern Typikon of the Great Church, namely, the current Typikon, the distribution was transferred after the exaposteilarion, "Holy is the Lord our God,"[1308] when the prayer is read, and the distribution of palms takes place during the chanting of lauds.[1309] The transfer probably was done on the analogy to the transfer of the eōthinon gospel in order for more people to be present, again in the anticipation of the beginning of the procession that according to some witnesses began at the third idiomelon of lauds, "Go forth, O nations, and go forth, O peoples . . .,"[1310] according to the liturgical association well-known also from other instances.

The procession was abolished in cities, as it seems, during the Tourkokratia.[1311] The final testimony is provided for parish practice

---

1305. "λέγουσι προκείμενον ἦχος ς'."

1306. "Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος . . ."

1307. Νικόδημος Σκρέττας, ed., *Τυπικὸν τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἀκολουθίας τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἁγίας Λαύρας τοῦ Ὁσίου καὶ Θεοφόρου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Σάββα* (Ἱερουσαλήμ: Ἱερὰ καὶ Σεβασμία Λαύρα Σάββα τοῦ Ἡγιασμένου Ἱερουσαλήμ, 2012), 321.

1308. "Ἅγιος Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν . . ."

1309. Γ. Βιολάκης, *Τυπικὸν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ Μεγάλης Ἐκκλησίας* (Ἀθῆναι: Μιχαὴλ Σαλίβερος, 1921), 353.

1310. "Ἐξέλθετε ἔθνη, ἐξέλθετε καὶ λαοί . . ."

1311. Author's Footnote: The procession of Palm Sunday, according to the testimony of the Rev. Fr. Iōannēs Ramphos (letter of February 24, 1976), was preserved on Cycladic Islands of Mēlos and Kimōlos. During the procession, which takes place after the Liturgy, the idiomela of the Litē are chanted and at the end of the procession the gospel reading for the Monday of Meatfare (Mark 11:1–11) is read from the beautiful gate.

by the Typikon of Saint Sophia of Thessaloniki, which we cited. Indeed, Symeōn had also composed two beautiful prayers, which were probably said alternately by year, before the gates of the temple of Saint Sophia, on the return of the procession "after the 'Lord have mercy.'"

Although the custom for the performance of the ancient procession during Palm Sunday was not restored after the lapse of the special circumstances,[1312] the reading of the prayer and the distribution of palms was preserved up until nowadays at lauds, and it takes place at that time in order for the faithful to hold the branches during the Divine Liturgy. The time is perhaps judged unsuitable because all the people are not present. I have the opinion that it is not proper for the distribution of palms to be transferred for this reason. The few attending will at that time receive their branches from the priest. Both because a large number will not attend, and because movements of such a kind, if they indeed take place with decorum, are not unknown in our worship, nor harm it, the disturbance of order is not a sufficient reason for a transfer. The example of the distribution of flowers for the Exaltation of the Precious Cross and the Veneration of the Cross, which takes place in the parishes at the end of the service, is not on point. The distribution is done here in order for the faithful to hold the palms during the procession and during the Divine Liturgy, or at least only during the Divine Liturgy, in remembrance of the event being celebrated. The hymnography expressly speaks about the faithful who carry "the symbols of victory" and receive once again the King of Glory, the conqueror of death, the coming Lord. At the end of the Liturgy, it is too late.

The example of a solution that was given by the modern parish practice for the kissing of the Gospel book during Sundays can serve for us as a guiding example. After the distribution to those present during lauds, the branches could be located beside the entrance of the temple or beside the proskynētarion and can be handed to those entering by a second priest, if there is one, or by another person. The fact that they did not receive the palms "from the hand of the

1312. Namely, the end of the Ottoman rule.

priest" will perhaps be the only undesirable thing. This will perhaps encourage the faithful to arrive earlier. In any case, all do not kiss the Gospel book during Sunday when it is offered by the priest for kissing, not even on the proskynētarion. The distribution of palms at the end of the Liturgy essentially harms this practice because it is also neither consistent with tradition nor with both the purpose and the meaning of their distribution.

300

When during the established feasts of the Lord, "As many of you that have been baptized into Christ . . ."[1313] or "Your cross we worship . . . ,"[1314] is chanted by the chanters instead of the trisagion hymn, after the inaudible prayer of the trisagion hymn what then must the celebrant say inaudibly, the trisagion, in order that the promise of the prayer be justified, "O Master, receive this even from the mouth of us sinners the trisagion hymn," or must he say "As many of you that have been baptized . . ." or "Your cross we worship . . ."?

In one of the older answers (question number 149) we wrote that although we do not have any standard rubric that prescribes in these cases as to what the priests must say, the practice correctly also prevails for them to say the festal hymn provided for instead of the trisagion, "As many of you that have been baptized . . .," or "Your cross we worship . . .," where applicable. These hymns were formerly chanted more times, obviously as an ephymnion at each verse or select verses from Psalm 79 ("Attend, O Shepherd of Israel . . .[1315]), from which also comes the verse, "[Lord, O Lord], look down from heaven and behold . . . ." (Psalm 79:15–16),[1316] which is said up until nowadays by the hierarch himself in the hierarchical Liturgy. The clergy also took part in this chanting, just as up until nowadays in concelebrations. As also up until nowadays, the clergy did not chant a hymn other than that provided for, namely, the trisagion, "As many

1313. "Ὅσοι εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε . . ."
1314. "Τὸν Σταυρόν σου προσκυνοῦμεν . . ."
1315. "Ὁ ποιμαίνων τὸν Ἰσραὴλ πρόσχες . . ."
1316. "[Κύριε, Κύριε,] ἐπίβλεψον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἴδε . . ."

of you that have been baptized . . . ," or "Your cross we worship . . .." The recitation of the trisagion or of the hymn chanted in its place, which is done by the celebrants according to the present taxis, is a substitution for their non-participation in the common chanting.

Other standard rubrics that can be applied by analogy to our case make up for the absence of a special rubric. This concerns the recitation by the celebrants of "Now the powers of the heavens . . . ,"[1317] which is chanted in the Presanctified. The priests, who do not participate in the chanting of the Cherubic hymn or that in its place, recite "Now the powers of the heavens . . . ," substituting also here for their non-participation in the common chant. The standard rubrics expressly prescribe here that they also recite the hymn chanted instead of the cheroubikon.

The question raises the issue upon another basis: The prayer of the trisagion hymn expressly refers to the chanting of the trisagion, "receive even from the mouth of us sinners the trisagion hymn." The initial phrases of the prayer also suggest this: "O Holy God who is resting among the holy ones, praised by the Seraphim with the thrice-holy voice . . . ."[1318] This prayer is indeed especially written as an introduction to the chanting of the trisagion.

However, the recitation by the priest alone of the trisagion, instead of "As many of you that have been baptized . . . ," or "Your cross we worship . . . ," only ostensibly would justify the "promise" of the prayer. Namely, it would only provide a facade of liturgical consistency. The people also again would not chant the trisagion, which is the subject and entreaty of the prayer. This is because the prayer does not refer only to the priests but to the entire church community, which united with the angelic powers, is about to glorify God in Trinity, as they chant the trisagion hymn together. It is preferable for us to accept these cases as exceptions according to which, for special reasons, similar Christological hymns suitable for the feast of the Lord take the place of the trisagion.

1317. "Νῦν αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν . . ."

1318. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ ἅγιος, ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπαυόμενος, ὁ τρισαγίῳ φωνῇ ὑπὸ τῶν σεραφὶμ ἀνυμνούμενος . . ."

We also have something relevant to this in the second prayer of the third kneeling for Pentecost Sunday Vespers ("O great and eternal God . . ."),[1319] where we seek from God the grace "in order with a contrite heart undistracted to offer to you the thrice-holy doxology,"[1320] but without us finally chanting the trisagion hymn. Similar phenomena are not unusual in our liturgical practice.

1319. "Ὁ Θεὸς ὁ μέγας καὶ αἰώνιος . . ."

1320. "τοῦ μετὰ συνετριμμένης καρδίας, ἀμετεωρίστως προσενεγκεῖν τὴν τρισάγιον δοξολογίαν."

Appendix 1 – Question 298

SCRIPTURAL PASSAGES FOR THE MYSTICAL SUPPER

Matthew 26:26–27	Mark 14:22–23	Luke 22:10–20	1 Corinthians 11:24–25
26 Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασε καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς καὶ εἶπε· Λάβετε φάγετε· τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου· 27 καὶ λαβὼν τὸ ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες·	22 Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασε καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπε· Λάβετε φάγετε τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου. 23 καὶ λαβὼν τὸ ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες.	10 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἰδοὺ εἰσελθόντων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν πόλιν συναντήσει ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον ὕδατος βαστάζων· ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν οὗ εἰσπορεύεται, 11 καὶ ἐρεῖτε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ τῆς οἰκίας· λέγει σοι ὁ διδάσκαλος, ποῦ ἐστι τὸ κατάλυμα ὅπου τὸ πάσχα μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω; 12 κἀκεῖνος ὑμῖν δείξει ἀνώγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον· ἐκεῖ ἑτοιμάσατε. 13 ἀπελθόντες δὲ εὗρον καθὼς εἴρηκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἡτοίμασαν τὸ πάσχα. 14 Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσε, καὶ οἱ δώδεκα ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ. 15 καὶ εἶπε πρὸς αὐτούς· Ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν· 16 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ. 17 καὶ δεξάμενος τὸ ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπε· Λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε ἑαυτοῖς· 18 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. 19 καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 20 ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων· Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον.	24 λάβετε, φάγετε· τοῦτό μού ἐστι τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 25 ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὁσάκις ἂν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

Appendix 2 – Question 298

ANAPHORA COMPARISON

Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*	Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos	Liturgy of Saint Markos	Anaphora of Saint Epiphanios of Cyprus	Alexandrian Liturgy of Saint Basileios the Great	Alexandrian Liturgy of Grēgorios the Theologian	Byzantine Liturgy of St Iōannēs Chrysostomos	Byzantine Liturgy of Saint Basileios the Great
ἀναβλέψας πρὸς σὲ τὸν Θεὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ Πατέρα καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκε . . .ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον κεράσας ἐξ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος καὶ ἁγιάσας, ἐπέδωκεν . . .	ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἀναδείξας σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλογήσας, ἁγιάσας, κλάσας, μετέδωκε . . . . ὡσαύτως . . . . ἀνετίσας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἀναδείξας σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ, εὐχαριστήσας εὐλογήσας, ἁγιάσας, πλήσας Πνεύματος ἁγίου, μετέδωκε . . .	ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν πρὸς σὲ τὸν ἴδιον Πατέρα, Θεὸν δὲ ἡμῶν καὶ Θεὸν τῶν ὅλων, εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλογήσας, ἁγιάσας, κλάσας, διέδωκε . . . ὡσαύτως . . . . ἀναβλέψας . . . . εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλογήσας, ἁγιάσας, πλήσας Πνεύματος ἁγίου, μετέδωκε . . .	ἀναδείξας σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ, εὐχαριστήσας, ἁγιάσας, ἔδωκε . . . ὡσαύτως . . . . ἐσφράγισε ποτήριον ἀθανασίας καὶ ἔδωκε . . .	ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὰ ὕψη τῶν οὐρανῶν πρὸς σὲ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Πατέρα, Θεὸν ἡμῶν καὶ Θεὸν τῶν ὅλων, εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλογήσας, ἁγιάσας, κλάσας, μετέδωκε . . . ὁμοίως . . . . εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλογήσας, ἁγιάσας, γευσάμενος πάλιν ἔδωκε . . .	ἔνευσας ἄνω πρὸς τὸν ἴδιόν σου Πατέρα, Θεὸν ἡμῶν καὶ Θεὸν τῶν ὅλων, ηὐχαρίστησας, ἡγίασας, ἔκλασας, μετέδωκας . . . ὡσαύτως . . . . ηὐχαρίστησας, ηὐλόγησας, ἡγίασας, μετέδωκας . . .	εὐχαριστήσας καὶ εὐλογήσας, ἁγιάσας, κλάσας, ἔδωκε . . .	ἀναδείξας σοὶ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ Πατρὶ, εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλογήσας, ἁγιάσας, κλάσας, ἔδωκε . . . ὁμοίως . . . κεράσας, εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλογήσας, ἁγιάσας, ἔδωκε . . .

Liturgy of the *Apostolic Constitutions*	Liturgy of Saint Iakōvos	Liturgy of Saint Markos	Anaphora of Saint Epiphanios of Cyprus	Alexandrian Liturgy of Saint Basileios the Great	Alexandrian Liturgy of Grēgorios the Theologian	Byzantine Liturgy of St Iōannēs Chrysostomos	Byzantine Liturgy of Saint Basileios the Great
looking up toward you, his God and Father, and breaking he gave . . . likewise mixing the cup of wine and water and sanctifying, he again gave . . .	looking up to heaven and showing forth to you, God and Father, having given thanks, blessed, sanctified, broken, he imparted . . . likewise . . . gazing earnestly to heaven and showing forth to you, God and Father, having given thanks, blessed, sanctified, filled with the Holy Spirit, he imparted . . .	looking up to heaven toward you, his own Father, our God and God of all, having given thanks, blessed, sanctified, broken, he distributed . . . likewise . . . looking up . . . having given thanks, blessed, sanctified, filled with the Holy Spirit, he imparted . . .	showing forth to you, God and Father, having given thanks, sanctified, he gave . . . likewise . . . he sealed a cup of immortality and gave . . .	looking up to the heights of the heavens toward you, his own Father, our God and the God of all, having given thanks, blessed, sanctified, broken, he imparted . . . likewise . . . having given thanks, blessed, sanctified, tasted, again he gave . . .	you raised your head toward your own Father, our God and the God of all, gave thanks, blessed, sanctified, broke, imparted . . . likewise . . . you gave thanks, blessed, sanctified, imparted . . .	having given thanks and blessed, sanctified, broken, he gave . . .	showing forth to you, God and Father, having given thanks, blessed, sanctified, broken, he gave . . .